





1700020804

MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE

CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA



ANDREW S. THOMAS
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

CALL NUMBER

270.6
C549a

ACCESSION

33629

THIS BOOK PRESENTED
BY

Anonymous

Date Due

APR 14 '62	NOV 17 '84		
MAR 2 '63	Library		
MAR 23 '69			
DEC 7 '69			
DEC 19 '84			
DEC 18 '65			
MAY 13 '67			
NOV 16 '68			
NOV 16 '68			
DEC 13 '71	H. C. LIBRARY		
NOV 23 '74	M. H. C.		
LIBRARY '75			
M. H. C.			
JUL 8 '77			
M. H. C.			
MAR 25 '78			
M. H. C. LIBRARY			
LIBRARY '78			
28	PRINTED IN U. S. A.		

Nov



Ten Epochs of Church History

Edited by

John Fulton, D.D., LL.D.

Vol. X.

DISCARD

Ten Epochs of Church History

THE
ANGLICAN REFORMATION

BY

Robinson

WILLIAM CLARK

M.A. (OXON.), HON. LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.



New York

The Christian Literature Co.

MDCCCXCVII

Andrew S. Thomas Memorial Library

Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va.

33629

270.6
C549A

Copyright, 1897, by
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE Co.



CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.—THE ANGLICAN CHURCH BEFORE THE CONQUEST	1
CHAP. II.—THE NORMAN KINGS	12
CHAP. III.—THE PLANTAGENETS.....	21
CHAP. IV.—WYCLIF AND THE LOLLARDS... ..	36
CHAP. V.—THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.....	49
CHAP. VI.—PRECURSORS OF THE REFORMATION—COLET, MORE, ERASMUS.....	56
CHAP. VII.—EARLY DAYS OF HENRY VIII	61
CHAP. VIII.—HENRY AND CATHARINE.....	71
CHAP. IX.—THE SUPREMACY.....	79
CHAP. X.—THE RELIGIOUS HOUSES.....	90
CHAP. XI.—REFORMATION AND REACTION... ..	100
CHAP. XII.—EDWARD VI. AND THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK,	122
CHAP. XIII.—THE FIRST ENGLISH ORDINAL.....	147
CHAP. XIV.—FOREIGN INFLUENCES AND THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK.....	155
CHAP. XV.—ACCESSION OF MARY.....	185
CHAP. XVI.—THE MARIAN PERSECUTION.....	203
CHAP. XVII.—THE ELIZABETHAN REFORM.....	248
CHAP. XVIII.—THE CONSECRATION OF PARKER.....	265
CHAP. XIX.—QUEEN ELIZABETH AND ARCHBISHOP PARKER.....	277
CHAP. XX.—THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION.....	292
CHAP. XXI.—THE ADVERTISEMENTS.....	305
CHAP. XXII.—GRINDAL AND THE PROPHESYINGS.....	318
CHAP. XXIII.—WHITGIFT AND PURITANISM.....	325

CHAP. XXIV.—RICHARD HOOKER.....	350
CHAP. XXV.—KING JAMES I. AND ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT	363
CHAP. XXVI.—ARCHBISHOP ABBOT AND CALVINISM.....	383
CHAP. XXVII.—KING CHARLES I. AND ARCHBISHOP LAUD	391
CHAP. XXVIII.—THE LONG PARLIAMENT AND THE RE- BELLION.....	414
CHAP. XXIX.—THE COMMONWEALTH.....	435
CHAP. XXX.—THE WORK OF THE RESTORATION.....	441

PREFACE.



THE story of the Anglican Reformation has been told so often and so well that any new laborer in the same field can hardly lay claim to fresh discoveries or novelty of views. All the incidents in this great drama are so well known that there is little probability of any important addition being made to the information which we already possess; and no sane judgment on the characters of the men who shaped the course of the movement can be expected to differ widely from the accepted verdict of history.

The writer of the present volume lays claim only to having endeavored to state the facts with the greatest possible impartiality. His own point of view is, of course, Anglican; but he trusts and believes that he has done no injustice to any of those whose religious opinions are different from his own.

In telling the story of the Reformation in England he has done his best to make the successive changes in the statement of doctrine and in the manner of worship intelligible to the reader; and he believes that in this way he has best done justice to the aims of the men by whom those changes were promoted.

It is not the plan of these volumes to give a citation of authorities; but those who may desire such guidance will find it in Burnet, Lingard, Perry, and

Moore. Wherever the writer has been conscious of direct obligation to previous works, this has been indicated.

The volume is larger than the writer intended, so that he refrains from printing long lists of authorities; but these will be found in the valuable posthumous work on the Reformation by the Rev. Aubrey Moore.

To the Rev. Dr. Welch, Provost of Trinity College, the best thanks of the writer are due for his kindness in assisting to revise the proofs.

WILLIAM CLARK.

*Trinity College, Toronto,
Michaelmas, 1897.*

THE ANGLICAN REFORMATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH BEFORE THE CONQUEST.

HE Anglican Reformation had certain features in common with the religious convulsions which took place about the same period in Europe, but it was distinguished by other characteristics of its own. In Germany, in Switzerland, in Scotland there was an almost complete sweeping away of the institutions of the Middle Ages and of earlier periods. In England there was not, and there was not intended to be, any break in the continuity of the Church. Moreover the changes which were brought about were revolutionary only in the sense of throwing off what was regarded as the encroachments of unlawful authority. The English Reformation differed from the Protestant Revolutions almost as much as the English Revolution of 1688 from the French Revolution of 1789. It is not, therefore, difficult to understand that, in the eyes of foreign Protestants, it should always have appeared as a very imperfect measure of reform.

The leading and predominant idea in the series of

events which may be said to have begun in the reign of Henry VIII. and to have been consummated in the time of Charles II. was the rejection of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, which was not meant at first to be a denial of his primacy. To those who took part in bringing about the independence of the English Church, the work in which they were engaged in nowise partook of the character of rebellion, but was rather the realization of an idea which had always, either explicitly or implicitly, been operative in the history of the English Church and people. England had never recognized the right of the Pope to interfere in the government of her national Church; nor had she allowed the members of the Church, unconditionally and without restraint, to carry their appeals to Rome. In certain cases such appeals were believed to be conducive to the interests of justice and were therefore allowed. But such permission was by no means universal.

It is, therefore, obvious that, if we would rightly understand the significance of the English Reformation and the nature of the changes which were effected, we must carefully examine the early history of the relations of the Church to the Roman see, and consider the circumstances and influences under which the papacy got increased power or was compelled to relax its authority over the Anglican communion. We shall then be able the better to understand whether the revolt of the sixteenth century was the assertion of a lawful liberty or the casting off of an authority which had been ordained by God.

The introduction of Christianity into the British Isles must have taken place at a very early period, probably in the second or even in the first century. But the legends which profess to relate the history of this event are of no value. As regards the question of the relation of the British Church to the see of Rome, we need not be detained for a moment. It is not merely that there was no connection whatever that can be traced; but, in fact, the claims of the Roman see were hardly heard of anywhere before the fourth century. When the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) assigned the first place to the Bishop of Rome, it gave the second to the Bishop of Constantinople as being the Bishop of New Rome. The primacy of Peter and his successors does not seem to have occurred to them. The same position substantially was taken by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, two years later than the invasion of Britain under Hengist and Horsa. The state of the British Church, therefore, has no relation to the controversies of the Reformation. It is with the introduction of Christianity among the heathen Saxons that the influence of the Roman see in England begins.

The Saxon invaders were heathens and had driven British Christianity away to the West, to Wales, to Strathclyde, and to the western coast of Scotland. It was a Roman mission, sent by Gregory the Great, headed by the monk Augustine, which brought the Gospel to the Kingdom of Kent, whose sovereign, Ethelbert, was predisposed for the reception of Christianity by having married Bertha, daughter of the

Frankish King Charibert of Paris. The missionaries landed in 597 in the Isle of Thanet, where Hengist and Horsa had landed in 449. In a similar manner Christianity spread from Kent to Northumbria through a daughter of Ethelbert having married King Edwin, and having taken with her Paulinus as a chaplain to the northern Kingdom. The first instance of a collision between the insular tradition and that of Rome came out at the Conference or Synod at Whitby, in the year 664, at which the question arose as to whether the English Church should follow the British customs or those of Rome. The principal point was the date of the Easter Festival. The Britons were not on the side of the Quartodecimans, as has been alleged, since they kept the festival on the Sunday, but their mode of calculating the day was different from that of the Romans. Wilfrid, Bishop of York, argued on the Roman side, setting forth that they followed the tradition of Peter, to whom Christ had committed the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Colman, the advocate of the custom of Iona, could plead no such authority for his founder, Columba; and King Oswi decided for the Roman use. "I will rather," said the King, "obey the porter of heaven, lest, when I reach its gates, he who has the Keys in his keeping turn his back on me, and there be none to open." It was the turning point in the history of English Christianity. However we may view the legend of St. Peter, it cannot be doubted that the Church of England was, by this decision, beneficially connected with the great western communion, and came to par-

ticipate in the civilization of the West and the organization of the Latin Church.

The most important influence in the organization of English Christianity was a Greek, Theodore of Tarsus. He was sixty years of age, and a layman, when he was sent by Pope Vitalian (A. D. 668) to be Archbishop of Canterbury. Theodore resolved to organize the Church in England after the Roman model, and in subdividing the existing dioceses, he came into collision with Wilfrid by consecrating three new bishops to act with him in his diocese. At the National Council held at Hertford (673) the subject of the division of existing dioceses had been brought forward, but nothing had been decided; and Theodore proceeded to carry out his own plans. The diocese of York extended from the Forth to the Humber, and a division was clearly necessary; but Theodore, for whatever reason, did not consult Wilfrid. Merely obtaining the consent of the king, he divided the diocese into four parts, consecrating three new bishops to the dioceses of Bernicia, Lindisfarne, and Lindsey (678).

It does not fall within the scope of this volume either to describe the work done by Archbishop Theodore in the organization of the English Church, or to do justice to the great merits of Wilfrid as a devoted and laborious bishop. Here and elsewhere our business is to follow out the relations between the see of Rome and the Anglican communion; and the case of Wilfrid is one of considerable significance.

Wilfrid determined to carry an appeal to Rome

against the action of Theodore and the King. Both sides were represented at a Roman Synod held by Pope Agatho in October, 679. It appears that Wilfrid here declared himself to be quite ready to consent to the division of his diocese, when it was necessary; if only bishops should be given to him with whom he could live side by side. It was then decreed that Wilfrid should be restored, and that, in concert with the synod to be held in England, he should himself select his three suffragans. These were to be consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other three were to be removed. It was also proposed, at this Roman Synod, that England should be divided into twelve dioceses; and that these should form one province. The Roman Abbot and Precentor John was sent as legate to England, to coöperate with Theodore in holding a synod for the settlement of existing controversies. Some of the details connected with the Roman Council are open to question, but the statement here made is sufficiently trustworthy. For some reason Wilfrid did not immediately return to England, but remained in Rome and took part in the Council held there, in 680, on the question of the Monothelite heresy.

When Wilfrid returned to England and required that he should be reinstated, in accordance with the decision of the Roman Council, King Egfrid, of Northumbria, presiding at a great assembly of the Kingdom, (680 or 681), was so far from yielding to the appeal that he condemned Wilfrid to prison where he remained for nine months. The case of Wilfrid

must be admitted to be of great interest. The see of Rome had for several centuries been extending its influence over the West, and generally with beneficial effects. Appeals had been carried to the Pope from different parts of the Church; but the question had never been clearly decided as to the right of those who had grievances to make those appeals, or of the Church of Rome to hear them. It would not, perhaps, be easy to say exactly what was the English theory on the subject, although there would be no such difficulty as to the Roman view. On the one hand, it seemed to be generally recognized, throughout the Western Church, that the Roman primacy was not only useful, but a divine institution; but, on the other hand, it was by no means conceded that any one who wished had a right to carry his appeal to Rome without the consent of the King, or that the King was bound to give effect to the decisions of the Pope, or of a Roman Council.

After nine months Wilfrid was liberated and retired into Mercia, but finding no peace there, he proceeded to the territory of the South Saxons, where he accomplished a great missionary work. After five years, on the death of Egfrid (686), he returned to Northumbria, and administered for a time the diocese of Hexham. Subsequently Bosa, the occupant of the see of York, was induced to retire, and Wilfrid was restored to his former position. Even then, however, the Bishop of Lindisfarne was not removed, so that the decrees of the Roman Synod were not carried into effect; and Wilfrid was required to acquiesce in the arrangement made by Theodore.

This he seems to have done during the life of the Archbishop, to whom he became reconciled; but, when the occupants of the new sees died out, Wilfrid, by degrees, got possession of nearly the whole of his old diocese. At a Council held at Easterfield in Yorkshire (701) Wilfrid was asked whether he would acquiesce in the division of his diocese by Theodore. He refused and again appealed to Rome. The decision, although substantially in favor of Wilfrid, was not wholly satisfactory, so that he wanted to be allowed to spend his remaining days at Rome; but the Pope, John VI., required him to return to England. At a Council held on the river Nidd, (706) it was decided that Wilfrid should have the see of Hexham, together with the minster of Ripon, so that no attention was paid to the Roman decrees that he should be restored to his see of York. Shortly afterwards he died at Oundle (709).

Another bond of connection between England and Rome was established by the payment of Peter's Pence, begun by Offa of Mercia in 787. This King resolving that his own Kingdom should not be inferior ecclesiastically to Northumbria or Kent, wished Lichfield to be raised to the dignity of an Archbishopric. Pope Hadrian sanctioned the arrangement on condition of Peter's Pence being paid. Four bishops of Mercia and two of East Anglia were made suffragans of Lichfield. The theory was that a penny should be paid by every household; and a sum of £201 9s. was paid as a composition. Under the son and successor of Offa this arrangement was annulled and the sees reunited to the province of Canter-

bury; but Peter's Pence continued to be paid. It should be added that, although the papal sanction was obtained for both of these measures, the authority by which they were carried out was that of the English Synods.

The fact that the great St. Dunstan, when made Archbishop of Canterbury (959), applied to Rome for the pall and in other ways promoted the extension of Roman influence, is of considerable significance; and may enable us to understand the manner in which the Roman see obtained its supremacy over the whole of the Western Church. It was not merely the great authority of the Eternal City and a very natural wish to be connected with it, which induced the bishops to look to Rome for help and sympathy; although it was certainly the preëminence of Rome that induced the early councils to give the primacy to its bishop. Nor was it merely the spread of the legend of the Petrine supremacy, although this alone, when it came to be held as an undoubted fact, prevented the papal authority from being thrown off. But there were other considerations which made union with the great central see desirable, and even, in the eyes of mediæval ecclesiastics, almost necessary. On the one hand, the Church of Christ is not a mere national society, but one which includes the whole race of man; and it is impossible to doubt that a particular national church is liable to dangers which might be warded off or modified by fellowship with other Churches. On the other hand, there would certainly arise evils of no slight magnitude from the immense power and influence which the royal

authority would exercise in a national Church, if not checked or corrected by some spiritual authority from without. In our own days both of these dangers are greatly diminished, the first by the easy and rapid communication with all parts of the world, and the second by our popular government in Church and State. But the history of the Eastern Church will amply illustrate the evils which arise from the dominance of the secular power; and the great liberal Catholic movement which took place in France under Lamennais, Lacorairé, and Montalembert, was a distinct religious protest against the Erastianism and unspirituality which they believed to be involved in Gallicanism. Such considerations may enable us to understand how the Churches of the Middle Ages found it natural and necessary to seek for close union and communion with the see of Rome.

It was not merely by his application to the Pope for the archiepiscopal pall that St. Dunstan manifested his Roman leanings. He did so also by the favor which he showed to monasticism and by his preference of regulars to the secular clergy. It was not merely that many of the clergy at that time were married men; but many of those who lived in community as secular canons were noted for the irregularity of their lives. Efforts were, therefore, made by several of the bishops, backed by the authority of the king, to put the control and conduct of the Cathedrals into the hands of the Benedictines. These endeavors were followed by a certain measure of success; but many of the chapters remained secular. The enforcing of

celibacy among the secular clergy was still more difficult. Not only were many of them, as now in the Eastern Church, married before their ordination ; but many also married after they were ordained. When difficulties were found in the way of prohibition by law, ways were found of different kinds for removing the married clergy from their posts. As the Pope usually found his firmest defenders among the regular clergy, it is evident that these measures helped indirectly to confirm the papal power.

Edward the Confessor did more than any other English sovereign to bring the Church of England under the sway of Rome. The king was scarcely an Englishman. He was the son of a Norman mother and was Norman in all his thoughts and habits ; and the Normans generally had great devotion to the Roman see. Moreover, Edward himself had a special devotion to St. Peter, and resolved to do everything in his power to increase the papal authority over the Church. In honor of St. Peter he rebuilt the great Church on the Isle of Thorney which we know as the Abbey of Westminster, again rebuilt by Henry III. and others. But within eight days of the consecration of the Church, at which he was unable to be present, King Edward died, and the Witan elected Harold, the Queen's brother, as his successor. Harold was crowned by Stigand who had been elected irregularly to the see of Canterbury.

CHAPTER II.

THE NORMAN KINGS.



CAREFUL consideration of the relations subsisting between William the Conqueror and the papacy will enable us to form a fairly accurate notion of the kind of authority then conceded to the see of Rome. It is at once quite clear that, by this time, the power of the papacy, religious and secular, was so great that no monarch could afford to ignore it. When one sovereign was at enmity with another, he felt stronger when the Pope was on his side; yet it was seldom, except in times of direst need, that any direct power was acknowledged as belonging to the sovereign pontiffs. William the Conqueror gladly availed himself of the support of the Roman see when he was about to invade England. When he was firmly seated upon the throne, he fell back upon customs and precedents. Certain claims and privileges he conceded to the Pope; but when it came to the assertion of any rights over the English Crown, William at once made it clear that none such could be allowed, even although the claimant was Gregory VII., the mighty Hildebrand. William and Lanfranc, whom he had brought over from the Norman Abbey of Bec to be Archbishop of Canterbury, although both eager to draw closer the bonds between England and Rome, had no idea of surrendering the

liberties of the English Church. When Gregory, through his legate, made the demand that William should do homage to him for his Kingdom, and should pay the arrears of Peter's Pence owing to the papacy, the King made his mind on the subject quite distinct. He was ready to allow the one request, but not the other. "Homage," he declared, "I have never willed to pay, nor do I will it now. I have never promised it, nor do I find that my predecessors ever did it to yours. The money shall be paid more regularly." William also declared that no Pope was to be recognized without the approval of the Crown, nor any letters or bulls from Rome promulgated without his consent. Moreover, synods could not be held without his license, and their decrees were not valid until he had confirmed them. Excommunications of royal tenants and officers could not be pronounced without the authority of the King. Never was the royal supremacy more clearly and emphatically declared than by William the Conqueror, under the papacy of Gregory VII. Even the King's right to invest a bishop with staff and ring—a burning question between the papacy and the empire—does not seem to have been questioned. The practical effect of the Norman Conquest, however, was, in various ways, to bring the English Church more completely under Roman influence. The displacement of Englishmen and the appointment of Normans, as bishops of the Church, tended in this direction; as did also the greater enforcement of clerical celibacy, especially by a canon passed at Winchester, forbidding matrimony to the capitu-

lar clergy. Another change had perhaps even greater importance—the separation of the civil and the ecclesiastical courts. In the English Church before the conquest all causes had been heard in the same courts; but now they were separated. William had herein no thought of abandoning any part of his authority, but merely wished to make the provinces distinct, in accordance with Norman methods. The change led, in subsequent reigns, to complications which will have to be noted.

The conflict between St. Anselm of Canterbury and William Rufus was chiefly a dispute respecting the property of the Church. William had kept the primatial see vacant for four years, and had alienated some of the lands of the Church. The dispute for the possession of these lands became a very bitter one. Even when Rufus got the Pope to send the pall to him that he might convey it to the Archbishop, it would appear that it was rather for the sake of making money than of asserting his authority. When Anselm steadily refused to accept it at the hands of the King, the latter gave way by having it placed on the altar at Canterbury, from whence Anselm assumed it. But the controversy over the property of the Church could not be settled, and Anselm went abroad, partly to lay the matter before the Pope. In his absence William Rufus died, and Anselm returned to England (1100).

The dispute of Anselm with the new King, Henry I., was of a more serious character. Henry was a man of great ability and of very different principles from his brother. At his accession he declared that he

would not appropriate the goods of the Church, as his predecessor had done. But he had no intention of relinquishing his rights of patronage or investiture. He stood upon the rights which his father had asserted. He would have no man in the Kingdom who was not his subject, and Anselm's refusal of homage was practically a declaration that the King was not his over-lord. When the King insisted, Anselm offered to abide by the decision of the Pope, which was not easily obtained, the Pope being unwilling to concede the King's claim, and yet afraid of losing the allegiance of England.

In Lent, 1103, the King appeared at Canterbury and demanded that the Archbishop should do homage in the customary manner. Anselm refused, set off for Rome, and remained there for three years. On his return an assembly was held in the King's palace in London (1107), at which a compromise, sanctioned by the Pope, was adopted. "For," says Eadmer, "the Pope standing firm in the sentence which had been promulgated, had conceded the matter of homage, which Pope Urban had forbidden equally with investitures, and by this means got the King to yield about investitures. Then, in the presence of Anselm, the multitude of people standing by, the King agreed and enacted that from henceforth no one should be invested in England in a bishopric or abbey by the giving of a pastoral staff or a ring by the King, or any lay hand; and Anselm agreed that no person elected to prelacy should be debarred from consecration on account of the homage which he should do to the King." Fifteen years later, by the Con-

cordat of Worms (1122), a similar settlement was made between the Emperor and the Pope, as, in fact, the only one possible. The Church had become powerful enough to assert her rights, and the assertion of them to this extent seemed not unjust or unreasonable. On the other hand, the Sovereign could not recognize a spiritual peer in one who refused to acknowledge his suzerainty. Both requirements were met by this compromise.

One other work lay near to the heart of Anselm—the enforcement of clerical celibacy. All previous efforts in this direction seem to have failed. Not only were priests living with their wives, but some married after their ordination. In the year before the death of the Archbishop (1108), the King, carrying out his designs, convoked an assembly of bishops and magnates in London, at which it was decreed that priests who should continue to live with their wives should be deprived of their office after being pronounced infamous.

It was not long before another case occurred in which the royal and papal claims came into collision. After the death of Anselm, Henry kept the see of Canterbury vacant for five years; and when Ralph, Bishop of Rochester, was elected to fill the vacant place, a deputation of monks from Canterbury was sent to Rome to procure the pall. The Pope, Paschal II., consented in a very ungracious manner, and at the same time he wrote an angry letter complaining of the want of respect shown to the Roman see by the Church and King of England. They held councils, elected bishops, and generally acted in a

perfectly independent manner, sending no appeals to Rome and referring no questions for the papal decision. English ecclesiastics were sent to Rome to explain the position taken by their Church; and the Pope responded by appointing a permanent legate to reside in England. The rumor of this proceeding stirred up the opposition of the nobles and higher clergy, and the King refused the legate permission to enter the country. The Pope had to submit: he wrote a letter to the King, professing that he had not meant in any way to encroach upon the privileges of the see of Canterbury.

The same assurance was given by his successor, Calixtus II. Nevertheless, he consecrated Thurstan to the see of York, in spite of the King's warning and the protest of the Archdeacon of Canterbury who was present. At the same time he declared the Archbishop of York no longer subject to the see of Canterbury (1119). In consequence of the Pope's action, Henry forbade Thurstan to take up his residence in England. When, again, Calixtus made up his mind to have a legate in England, the King gave him permission to enter the country; but explained that he could not receive him as legate without first consulting the higher clergy and nobles, and in fact indicated that they had not been accustomed to legates in England, and had no desire to make a beginning. The King and the Archbishop of Canterbury managed to get rid of the Pope's representative, letting him understand that his master had not acted well towards the see of Canterbury.

Soon after this Archbishop Ralph died, and was

succeeded by William of Corbeil, who went to Rome to receive the pall. Thurstan of York took care to be there at the same time, to see that the newly acquired privileges of his see were not withdrawn. Both agreed that the questions between Canterbury and York should be decided at an English synod, presided over by a papal legate; and John, Cardinal of Crema, was appointed to this post. We see here how the quarrels between ecclesiastics were ever tending to give more power to the sovereign pontiff, just as happened when the secular powers fell out.

The two Archbishops, eager to conciliate the favor of the legate, emulated each other in the endeavor to do him honor, and the King for political reasons, withdrew the opposition which he had shown to the earlier attempt to introduce legatine authority. The clergy and laity, however were differently disposed towards this innovation, remembering that "all the successors of Augustine had been primates and patriarchs, and had never been placed under the dominion of any Roman legate." In spite of this the legate presided at a synod held at Westminster, September 9, 1125.

The canons passed at this synod with regard to simony, pluralities, patronage, and the like were merely a repetition of those which had been made at previous continental synods. So also in regard to women, priests were forbidden to have any women in their houses except mother, sister, aunt, or any one with respect to whom no suspicion could arise. The relation of York to Canterbury—the very question which the legate came over to settle—

was left undetermined; in consequence of which the two Archbishops betook themselves to Rome, to have it settled. The Pope evaded the real question, and gave a decision which secured an increase of authority to himself, by appointing Archbishop William of Canterbury his legate, and as such superior to the Archbishop of York. The Archbishop apparently did not see, or would not see, that, whilst he was adding to his personal importance, he was undermining the authority of his own primatial see. The King did not seem to realize that another was silently assuming his authority; for, whilst the Archbishop was the subject of the English Sovereign, the legate could be only the delegate of the Pope. From the time of Stephen Langton this state of things continued, the Archbishop of Canterbury regularly receiving a commission from the Pope to act as his legate. It can easily be imagined how such an arrangement left it an open question whether the Archbishop was exercising his own metropolitical authority or was acting as the representative of the Roman Pontiff.

Henry I. died in 1135, and, on the whole, the liberties of the English Church had been diminished and the influence of the see of Rome had advanced during his reign. At its beginning he had been strengthened by the support of Archbishop Anselm in his struggle with his elder brother, Duke Robert of Normandy, for the crown of England; and towards the end of his reign he was anxious to obtain the support of the clergy for the succession of his daughter Matilda to the throne.

The reign of Stephen was so full of confusion that it can teach us little on any legal or constitutional question; yet Stephen, amid all his difficulties, forbade under penalties any appeal from his authority to Rome. He went so far as to inhibit Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury from attending a council at Reims; and when the Archbishop escaped across the channel, he drove him into exile after his return. But the weakness of his government made him consent to a reconciliation.

CHAPTER III.

THE PLANTAGENETS.

HEN Henry II. succeeded to the throne (1154), confusion and anarchy were almost universal in Church and in State; and the first business of the King was to restore the reign of law and order. In doing so, he found the course of justice impeded by feudal and clerical privileges of all kinds; and the King resolved that all breakers of the law of the land should answer for their offences before the ordinary courts. Any violation of ecclesiastical law, he argued, was rightly examined before the Church courts; but a crime committed against person or property should be considered before a civil tribunal. Whilst Thomas Becket was merely Archdeacon of Canterbury and King's Chancellor, he gave to his sovereign his help in carrying these measures into effect. When he became a Priest and an Archbishop (1162), he began to see that his duties to the Church forbade such compliance.

The nature of the conflict between Henry II. and Archbishop Thomas Becket will be quite intelligible, if we consider the point of view of the two men. If we merely or chiefly occupy ourselves with the violence of the King and the obstinate wilfulness of the Archbishop, we shall be dealing with the mere

accidents and not with the essential question.¹ The King was resolved on dealing even-handed justice to all alike; and to him it seemed a monstrous thing that a murderer should escape the punishment of death by pleading benefit of clergy, and claiming to be tried by an ecclesiastical court. Here, it must be admitted, the verdict of history has been given to the King. On the other hand, Becket was aware of the danger of the encroachment of the royal authority into every domain, so as to endanger the free action of the Church and the Episcopate. Both were perfectly sincere; and each, from his own point of view, had a good case.

It was not long before Becket came into collision with the King; but it was the passing of the Constitutions of Clarendon (A. D. 1164) that brought the dispute to a distinct issue. These Constitutions were a sequel to the Charter of Henry I. and a kind of anticipation of the great Charter of John; and were intended not to introduce any new custom or regulation, but to set forth the actual law of the English Church. Among other provisions they enacted that clerics convicted of crime in the ecclesiastical court were not to be protected by the Church; that appeals were to be settled in the Archbishop's court by precept of the King, and to go no further without the King's consent; that no archbishops, bishops, or parsons should go out of the kingdom

¹ The reader could hardly find a better guide to the real nature of the controversy than Lord Tennyson's great play of Becket. The struggles of Becket are strikingly set forth. The great designs of the King are declared in his speech at Northampton; and the development of the tragedy is given with fairness and power.

without permission of the King; that all of the superior and beneficed clergy who held of the King in chief, should hold their possessions by barony, and do all rights and customs royal as other barons; that, when Archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbacies, or priories were vacant, the rents of them should go to the King.

Most of these provisions had been fully recognized as parts of the law of England, although some departures from them had occurred. For example, appeals to Rome had never been thought admissible without the sanction of the King, yet they had been carried thither. On the other hand, the reversal to the crown of the incomes of the higher clergy, during the vacancy of their benefices, seems to have been acted upon, as part of the feudal system, without there being any legal sanction for the practice. Becket at first gave his assent to the Constitutions of Clarendon; but finally, at the Council of Northampton, he refused to affix his seal to them; apparently holding that, whilst he might personally accept these laws, for which he afterwards expressed the deepest sorrow, he would not commit the Church to them.

The struggle was not immediately and directly between the royal and the papal power. At first, indeed, Becket was condemned for his obstinacy as much by the Church as by the State. Not only the King of France (Louis VII.) and the majority of the English Bishops sided against him; but even the Pope (Alexander III.) advised him to yield to the wishes of the King. It was the murder of the great Archbishop which gained for his side the victory

which could hardly have been secured by his persistency and intrepidity in life. The popular sentiment saw in the murder of Becket a martyrdom; and St. Thomas of Canterbury became the favorite Saint¹ of England down to the period of the Reformation. Whether the King intended to suggest the murder or not, he had to submit to public penance for his part in the persecution of the Archbishop. The Constitutions of Clarendon could not be enforced, and there was hardly any restraint imposed upon appeals to Rome. The clergy were allowed to be tried in their own courts. Thus, as so often happens, the violence of the party which was substantially in the right defeated the righteous aims which they had before them; and it was not merely the aggrandizement of the papal power that resulted from this violence and the crime in which it culminated, but justice came to be administered far less thoroughly and equitably.

No one who takes an impartial view of mediæval history will hastily decide that the papal authority was an unmixed evil. On the contrary it was sometimes, with all drawbacks, almost a necessity. A regal autocracy was not a form of government that could be trusted to do the best for all classes in the community; and although the barons formed a serious check on the royal power, yet sometimes the interests of the King and the nobles seemed to unite against the Church, and even when they were

¹An interesting testimony to this is found in the fact that Thomas is the second commonest man's name in England, John being, in all Christian countries, the most common.

opposed, the rights of the people at large were not much considered by either. The cross in the hand of the Priest was often the sole protection which the serf had against the sceptre or the sword.

The papal authority, however, was not at first asserted directly, and as a theory. Pretexts were found for intervention when disputes arose between the King and the Church, and finally, as has been pointed out, the Archbishop of Canterbury became ordinary legate, so that it was difficult to distinguish between his acts as Metropolitan and those of the representative of the Sovereign Pontiff.

One of the most serious disputes was that which arose on the death of Archbishop Hubert of Canterbury in 1205. Some of the monks elected Reginald, then sub-prior, to the vacant see; but, getting alarmed at the anger of the King, the general body chose de Grey, then Bishop of Norwich, the royal nominee. When the matter was explained to the Pope (Innocent III.) by the monks who had been sent to Rome for the purpose, his Holiness saw his opportunity, set aside both of the candidates, and induced the monks to elect Cardinal Stephen Langton, an Englishman resident at Rome. When King John heard of the consecration of Stephen by the Pope (June 17, 1207), he banished the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, and vowed vengeance against the Romans. It was no wonder. Such an invasion of the rights of the English Crown was unprecedented; and another King who should have had less ability than John, who could have counted upon the support of his people, might have succeeded in his

resistance. The Pope knew too well how little power was possessed by John. It was indeed an unequal combat. The papal power was at its highest point in the western conscience: it was at this time exercised by a man of great ability and of imperious will; and over against this power was a king hated and loathed by his people for every sort of vice and wickedness. Innocent replied to John by putting his kingdom under an interdict (March 24, 1208). All public worship ceased, even Christian burial. Baptism and the absolution of the dying alone were continued. John was unconcerned. In 1209 he was solemnly excommunicated by the Pope, but no one ventured to publish the Bull in England. Two years later he was threatened with deposition; and still he resisted. But in 1213, finding himself utterly unsupported, he made his submission to the Pope, not only receiving Stephen Langton as Archbishop, and making restitution to the clergy, but surrendering his kingdoms to Innocent and his successors as feudal superiors, and receiving them back as a vassal. He had done what had never been done by English King before, hoping that the papal support would avail him against his barons. But he found that his barons, with the very man at their head whom the Pope had forced upon him, were a match for King and Pope united.

At a council held at St. Paul's London, (Aug. 25, 1213), attended by bishops, abbots, priors, deans, and nobles, the Archbishop reminded them that the King had promised to rule by the "laws of King Edward," a common formula after the conquest, and these

laws, he said, were embodied in the Charter of Henry I. These were more favorable to the Church than those of the constitutions of Clarendon in regard to the temporalities during vacancies not being paid to the King. The barons swore to contend for these liberties to the death. Both the King and the legate paid little attention to the resolutions of the council; and two years afterwards (June 15, 1215), the Great Charter was signed at Runnymede, and became the guarantee of English freedom in Church and State. It has sometimes been said that England is indebted to the papacy for this boon. To Pope Innocent indeed she owes Stephen Langton as archbishop, but not the great charter. On the contrary he rewarded John for his submission by annulling the charter, he excommunicated the barons, and suspended Archbishop Stephen for refusing to publish the excommunication. Before he could give effect to his friendship for John, Innocent died (1216), and his successor Honorius III., reversed his action. King John died in the same year. As regards the Church the Great Charter did little more than declare that the liberties of the English Church should be maintained whole and inviolate, apparently with reference to the freedom of elections.

It is chiefly to Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, that the English people owe it that the contents of the Great Charter did not become a dead letter; for it is to Earl Simon that we owe the beginnings of parliamentary government in the reign of Henry III. (1265).

But this was near the end of that long reign dur-

ing which foreign influence and encroachment reached a height to which they had never before attained in England. At first, when the Pope, taking stand upon his feudal lordship, demanded certain subsidies in the shape of English benefices to be put at his disposal, the request was evaded, and finally rejected. But the Pope found ways of getting the revenues of the Church into his hands, by requiring large payments before giving a decision on questions referred to him for settlement. In ordinary affairs, it would be called taking bribes. Thus, at the election of a successor to Stephen Langton, when the monks and the King disagreed, the King promised the Pope a tenth of the whole revenue of England, if he would confirm his candidate, Richard le Grand. Richard was confirmed and consecrated at Canterbury. The barons and bishops resisted the payment of the tax; but they had to give in. The tax was levied by a papal agent and great sacrifices had to be endured in order to meet the demand. And these exactions in different forms went on to a degree almost incredible. In 1256 Alexander IV. laid claim to the first-fruits of all bishoprics and other benefices, an exaction which was continued until the rupture between Henry VIII. and the papacy.

Another papal encroachment, which probably did even more to injure the Church than the alienation of its revenues, was the claim to appoint to benefices in public patronage. By such means, foreigners, especially Italians, were appointed to English benefices, the emoluments of which they enjoyed without even residing in England. This abuse was known as

papal provisions. The consequences of these misdoings were terrible. Matthew Paris declares: "Simony was perpetrated without a blush, usurers plied their trade everywhere. Charity was dead, ecclesiastical liberty had wasted away, religion was trodden under foot;" and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, did not hesitate to declare that "the cause, the fountain, the origin of all this is the Court of Rome."

The English people had been growing restive under these abuses when an incident occurred which produced a crisis. Pope Innocent IV. nominated a nephew of his own, a mere boy, not in holy orders, to a prebendal stall in Lincoln, desiring the Bishop to induct him into any place that might fall vacant. Up to this time Grosseteste had generally been on the side of the Pope, but a demand like this was intolerable. In a letter to Innocent, which sounds almost like an anticipation or first note of the Reformation, the Bishop points out all the evil consequences which are flowing from such abuses. "On this ground," he goes on, "out of the debt of obedience and fidelity in which I am bound to the holy apostolic see, and from my love of union with it in the body of Christ, I refuse to obey the things which are contained in the said letter, because they most evidently tend to the sin which I have mentioned [of robbing human souls of divine ordinances in order to spend upon themselves], most abominable to the Lord Jesus Christ, and most pernicious to the human race, and are altogether opposed to the holiness of the apostolic see, and are contrary to Cath-

olic unity. I oppose these things and rebel against them." It is uncertain whether the Pope excommunicated Grosseteste in consequence of this boldness. If he did, the Bishop paid no attention to it; but repeated his charges to the last moment of his life, giving utterance to a sentiment which was daily acquiring increasing strength in the hearts of the English people (1253). The reign of Henry III. furnishes examples of many abuses in Church and State; but many of these do not bear upon the relations of England and Rome.

The accession of Edward I., was marked by the appointment of a Dominican Friar, Robert de Kilwardy to the see of Canterbury (1272), an appointment which could not be acceptable either to the secular clergy or to the monks. The fortunes of the monastic orders had been strangely varied. They had done great work for the Church in the preservation of ancient documents, in the cultivation of learning, in the diffusion of education. But they had undergone a regular process of deterioration, nominally retaining the vow of poverty, in the sense that no individual monk was owner of private property, whilst the monasteries became wealthy, luxurious, and in some cases immoral. The founders of the two great Mendicant orders, St. Dominic (1170-1221) and St. Francis (1182-1226), forbade to their friars the possession of any property whatever, making them dependent for their daily sustenance upon the alms which they might receive. Ultimately both orders disregarded these restrictions; but at first they were carefully observed, and this gave them

a great popularity with the laity who were angered by the inconsistencies of the monastic orders. But there was this one great drawback to their usefulness, that they were immediately dependent upon the Pope, and therefore used all their influence for the aggrandizement of his authority and the diminution of a national spirit in the churches.

Edward I., the most able member of the great Plantagenet family, saw the danger of the Church absorbing a large share of the property of the country. It was Archbishop Peccham who, by his high-handed conduct, stirred up King Edward to meet them by having the statute of mortmain passed by the Parliament of 1279, the first of a series of measures taken to prevent the enrichment of ecclesiastical corporations. It provided that "no religious person or any other whatsoever should presume to buy or sell any lands or tenements, or under pretence of donation, or grant, or any other title whatsoever, to receive such from any one; or by any method, act, or skill, to appropriate them in such a way as whereby such lands and tenements should devolve in any manner to the dead hand." If this were done, the lord in chief was to have the power of entering and seizing the fee. The object of the statute was manifest. It was not merely that the religious bodies could not be called upon for feudal service, and would probably evade the payment of pecuniary aids, but there would be no further transfer of the estates thus appropriated, and so the King would be deprived of the fines and other payments

made in such cases. The Archbishop made a great show of resistance, but speedily yielded.

Subsequently (1296) Edward had a contest with Archbishop Winchelsea and the clergy, of whom he had demanded an aid for the expense of a military expedition. The Archbishop pleaded that a papal Bull ("Clericis laicos") forbade the levying of such a tax, whereupon the King outlawed the whole clerical body (1279). The dispute ended in a compromise, the clergy agreeing to tax themselves, whilst the King gave up the right of taxing them without their consent, in this respect putting them in the same position as the laity. The clergy, however, agreed to give such supplies without the consent of the Pope.

The attempt of the Pope to claim a suzerainty over Scotland, and so obstruct King Edward's attempt on that country, was resented by the nobility even more strongly than by the King. Indeed the King, for special reasons, was not unwilling to conciliate the Pope; but the barons not only maintained the royal rights but brought about the passing of the act known as the Statute of Carlisle, which has been called the first direct anti-Roman Act ever passed by an English parliament. After reciting the various grievances endured from the Roman see, the interference with patronage, the alienation of Cathedral offices to foreigners, the exaction of Peter's Pence and other payments, with special reference to the extortion practised by a papal agent, called William de Testa, the Statute enacted that this agent should not be allowed to carry out of the country the money

which he had collected illegally; and that all who assisted him should be brought before the King's courts for trial.

The accession of Edward II. (1307) had the usual effect resulting from the place of a strong king being filled by a weak one. Everything fell into confusion; and only the weakness of the papal authority through the "Babylonish captivity" prevented the Pope from becoming absolute in the Church. Still the encroachments went on, and Edward III. (1327-1377) made sundry complaints to the papal see. So little notice was taken of these that, in 1343, Clement VI. made a "provision" on the English Church, of two thousand marks a year, for the support of two cardinals. The barons addressed a petition to the King, praying that he would put an end to these abuses; and the King promised to take action; and the barons themselves addressed a protest to the Pope. The papal officers were forbidden to prosecute the collection, and the people to assist them. A proclamation was made that no one should under penalty venture to introduce into the realm of England any bulls or instruments prejudicial to the crown. To the complaints made by the Pope, the King (1343) addressed a letter, complaining of the injuries inflicted upon the English Church by provisions and reservations; and some years later (1351) effect was given to the national sentiment by the passing of what was known as the first Statute of *Provisors*.

By this law the sending incomes of Monasteries out of the Kingdom was forbidden, the rights of patrons were asserted, and it was enacted that in

case of the Pope collating to any office, the appointment was to be null, and the King was to have the gift for one turn. Moreover, if any should procure provisions from the Pope, they were to be imprisoned until they had paid the fine in satisfaction of the King and the patron whose rights had been invaded. If legislation could have put a stop to the evil doings of the Court of Rome, they would have been stopped. But, unfortunately, when the necessities of the King made him at any time dependent on the assistance of the Roman Pontiff, the price he had to pay for such help was the setting aside or the suspension of anti-Roman laws; and this very statute was frequently ignored and, in one case, actually suspended by the King's personal authority.

For the time, however, the work of checking Roman encroachments went on. The Statute of Provisors was followed by the Statute of *Præmunire* (1353), a name taken from the first word in the writ addressed to the Sheriff contained in the Act; and other Acts passed for the same purpose are known by the same name. The aim of this law was to prevent vexatious appeals from being carried to Rome, which, on the one hand, ignored the King's court, and, on the other, set aside its decisions. The statute therefore enacted that if any English subject should lodge any such plea in courts not within the realm, he should have two months' notice to answer for contempt in the King's court, and if he did not appear, he should be outlawed, his property confiscated, and his person imprisoned during the King's pleasure. These statutes were testimonies to the

mind of the people of England, and they were not altogether without effect, although it was nearly two centuries before they were regularly recognized and acted upon as English law.

CHAPTER IV.

WYCLIF AND THE LOLLARDS.



SO far the opposition to Rome had been directed against encroachments on the liberties of the Church and the spoliation of the country in the interests of the papacy and papal nominees. These grounds of quarrel were never for long out of the minds of the people of England; but the time came when an attack was to be made upon the theology of the mediæval Church; and the leader in this attack was a man of remarkable intellectual strength and acuteness, of wide and varied learning, of a deep religious spirit, and of indomitable courage. This man was John Wyclif, born about 1320—a few years earlier than Chaucer—at Spreswell in Yorkshire. The incidents of his early life are most uncertain; but he became Master of Balliol College in 1361, the year of one of the great plagues known as the Black Death. In 1365, as appears probable, he became Warden of Canterbury Hall, although some think it was another man of the same name; but he was expelled from this post by the monastic members of the Hall, and this action was confirmed by a papal Bull in 1370, and by royal decree in 1372. In 1374 he was presented by the King to the Rectory of Lutterworth, in Leicestershire, which he held until the time of his death. Probably this was the result

of his friendship with John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, third son of Edward III.

It was about the year 1363, when he took his degree as Doctor of Divinity, that Wyclif became conspicuous in the national life of England. First of all, as Lechler observes, it is "Wyclif the patriot whom we have to place before the eye. He represents in his own person that intensification of English national feeling which was so conspicuous in the fourteenth century, when Crown and people, Norman population and Saxon, formed a compact unity, and energetically defended the autonomy, the rights and the interests of the Kingdom in its external relations, and especially in opposition to the Court of Rome. This spirit lives in Wyclif with extraordinary force. His great works still¹ unprinted, e. g., the three books *De Civili Dominio*, his work *De Ecclesia*, and others, leave upon the reader the strongest impression of a warm patriotism, of a heart glowing with zeal for the dignity of the Crown, for the honor and weal of his native land, for the rights and the constitutional liberty of the people." At his first appearance he was the statesman and the diplomatist, rather than the theologian, although there was always underneath the religious spirit, and "in the end his whole undivided strength was concentrated upon the ecclesiastical domain."

It is an error to say that Wyclif began his work as a reformer by an attack on the mendicant orders. It was not until after 1381, when he assailed the

¹The work *De Ecclesia*, and Book I. of *De Civili Dominio* have now been printed by the Wyclif Society in London, England.

doctrine of Transubstantiation that he began to oppose the mendicants who had come forward as the defenders of the doctrine.

In 1365 Urban V. demanded of Edward III. payment of the feudatory tribute, which had been in arrears for thirty-three years. This tribute had first been paid by King John to Innocent III. (1213), but it had never been paid regularly, and Edward III., from the time of his majority, had never paid it at all. The King brought Urban's demand before his parliament, (1366); and it was decided by the Lords spiritual and temporal, as well as by the Commons, that King John had no right to subject the country to this impost, and that they would resist to the uttermost any attempt on the part of the Pope to enforce his claim. It was the last time that the Bishop of Rome put himself forward as the feudal superior of the King of England. Wyclif took part in this controversy and wrote a pamphlet (*Determinatio quædam de Dominio*) on the English side; and it seems by no means unlikely that Wyclif was a member of this parliament.

Wyclif's pamphlet is of importance in more ways than one. In the first place it contains the first indication of his doctrine of Dominion, based upon the theory of feudal tenure; and further, it shows that his first contention with Rome was not on doctrinal, but on political grounds,—setting forth doctrines which are further expounded in the work, *De Dominio*. Beginning with denying the right of the spirituality to interfere in secular affairs, he proceeded to deny the lawfulness of the Church holding any temporal possessions

at all. For this reason he was at first favorable to the mendicant orders. Starting from the fundamental position that God was Lord of all, he proceeded to show that disloyalty to the Most High involved the forfeiture of all rights. He further taught that property belonged to the community, that the spiritual power should not meddle with secular affairs, and, if doing so, should be subject to civil law; that the Church should hold no property; that excommunication is not valid unless justified by the sin of the excommunicated person. Many of these propositions are now generally held, if not precisely in the same form; but the theory of dominion, which made the authority of an official depend upon his being in a state of grace, was obviously dangerous and led to serious consequences.

A parliament met in 1371, at which Edward III. demanded a large subsidy for carrying on the war. The clergy resisted the resolution passed to include them in the obligation to raise the money. The arguments of Wyclif which were strongly against the enrichment of the clergy, seem to have been used at this parliament, and to have made him very unpopular with the clergy, and, at the same time, to have recommended him to John of Gaunt and the Court party. He was chosen as one of the English commissioners to settle the dispute between the Papacy and the English Crown at Bruges (1374). It was at this time that the King suspended the Statute of Provisors by his mere prerogative; but the "Good Parliament" of 1376 took very strong measures against the Roman claims, setting forth the

many grievances under which the Kingdom was suffering, and asking that remedies might be found. There can be little doubt that Wyclif's influence was great throughout the whole of this controversy.

But it was not merely in the Parliament that his influence was felt. When John of Gaunt wanted to get supplies voted by convocation, he called in the aid of Wyclif. But the clergy were not easily coerced; and among other replies to the Duke's challenge they summoned Wyclif to appear before them to answer for the heresies of which he was accused. A quarrel between the Duke of Gaunt and Courtenay, Bishop of London, prevented the case from coming to a hearing.

But another way was to be found of dealing with the errors of Wyclif. His enemies had collected out of his writings nineteen propositions or conclusions which they sent to the Pope, desiring his judgment upon them. Most of these propositions were taken from the first book of his treatise *De Civili Dominio*, which we have now before us, so that we are able to say that his statements were not misrepresented.

It will be sufficient here to note the chief features of the nineteen theses.¹ His fundamental proposition is, that the rights of property and inheritance are not absolute and unconditioned, but dependent upon God's grace and will. In articles six and seven he lays it down that, "as God may take away the goods of fortune from a delinquent Church, so also may Kings and temporal rulers withdraw from those who abuse the property of the Church or fall into

¹ They may be found in Canon. Perry's History.

error, their temporal property, in a legal and moral manner. At the same time Wyclif does not pretend to say whether the Church is in error, nor is it his business to inquire: that is the business of temporal lords. From eight to fifteen theses guard against the abuse of the power of the keys. Such power must be used in conformity with the Gospel, or it is invalid. Cursing or excommunication, he says (Art. xi.), does not bind simply, but only so far as it is denounced against an adversary of the law of Christ; and again (Art. xv.): Then only does the Pope bind or loose, when he conforms himself to the law of Christ.

As a consequence of these representations Pope Gregory XI. issued a series of Bulls to the University of Oxford, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the King; but Edward III. was dead (June 21, 1377), before the Bull arrived. These documents produced no great immediate effect. The bishops were very lukewarm in the matter, perhaps afraid of ulterior consequences. The University of Oxford was worse, seeming, on the whole, to be on the side of Wyclif. The bishops waited for the report of the University, and the University made no report. The government was on the side of the accused, and especially the mother of the young King.

In the autumn of this year (1377), Wyclif was consulted by the English parliament as to the lawfulness of prohibiting treasure from passing out of the country in obedience to the Pope's command, and naturally gave his judgment in opposition to the

papal claim. Before this parliament he laid his reply to the Pope's Bulls. His defence was sustained by his University; but he had further to clear himself before the bishops; and in February 1378 he appeared in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, where his defence, couched in guarded language, was laid before the Council. But a stop was put to the proceedings by a dispatch from the Princess of Wales (Queen-mother), bidding them not presume to decide anything against Wyclif. Moreover the citizens of London and a great mob forced their way into the Chapel, and such confusion arose that the court had to be closed. When Wyclif, just a year before, had appeared before Bishop Courtenay in St. Paul's, the London mob had sided with their bishop: they have now gone over to the reformer.

In the same year Pope Gregory XI. died, and the papal schism began. This gave an impulse to Wyclif's anti-papal action, and led to his sending forth his "poor priests" to preach the Gospel throughout the country, and to his undertaking the translation of the whole Bible, which he accomplished with the help of Nicholas Hereford, who translated part of the Old Testament. The influence of these preachers was immense; and perhaps this is a proper place in which to express a doubt as to the truth of an opinion somewhat widely propagated—that the influence of Wyclif and the Lollards was of short duration in England. It is impossible to acquiesce in this opinion. It is not merely that the opinions and writings of Wyclif were circulated in Bohemia, and were accepted by Huss and Jerome:

that these men, in their turn, exercised a very powerful influence on the German Reformation, and this again on the Reformation in England; but it is almost demonstrable that the teaching of Wyclif lived on in a kind of undercurrent among the people of England, and may probably be still the very heart of that Puritanism which has, for centuries, been so large an ingredient in English religious life. This subject, however, will meet us again.

Wyclif was, more and more, departing from the traditional system of the Middle Ages. He was practically in rebellion against the Pope: he was circulating the Scriptures in English, and disseminating a spiritual teaching calculated to undermine many of the theories and practices of the age: he was now as hostile to the friars as he had been to the monks. Not only was their professed poverty very commonly a delusion, but they were the most energetic upholders of the papal power. And now (1381) he begins an attack on the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It was not the first time that the dogma had been assailed. Paschasius Radbertus, in setting forth the doctrine, had been assailed by Ratramnus, and Lanfranc by Berengarius; and Wyclif took up a position not greatly different from these earlier adversaries. It is not, indeed, quite easy to say what is the special relation of Wyclif's teaching to the current belief of his day. It might perhaps be compared to the so-called doctrine of Consubstantiation; but we might not then be much nearer to an understanding of the matter. At least it can be said that Wyclif disputed and denied the ordinary manner of

stating the doctrine, and so was the beginner of that which, after the death of Henry VIII., became a leading feature in the English Reformation, a denial of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

At last Courtenay, now Archbishop of Canterbury, determined to bring Wyclif to trial. He assembled a provincial council at Blackfriars, May 21, 1382, where, however, he found the chancellor and the proctors of Wyclif's University on the side of the accused. Indeed so strong was the feeling that the Archbishop's commissary said his life was not safe in Oxford. Theses taken from Wyclif's writings were condemned, some of his followers were imprisoned, but Wyclif himself was left undisturbed. The House of Lords passed an ordinance against his preachers, but the House of Commons threw it out (1382). Most of his own work was now done in retirement at Lutterworth, where he wrote the *Trilogus* and other works of importance. On the 28th of December, 1384, he received a second stroke of paralysis and died on New Year's Eve. The Council of Constance (1415) decreed that his remains should be dug up and burned, and this was done in 1428.

The followers of Wyclif were known as Lollards, a name the derivation of which is uncertain. The movement became so considerable that it was said, every second man in England was a Lollard. The poor preachers of Wyclif, with their long russet gown and uncouth speech, proclaiming in simple language the truths of the Gospel attained to great influence with the common people. "To be poor without mendicancy," says Professor Shirley, "to

unite the flexible unity, the swift obedience of an order, with free and constant mingling among the poor, such was the ideal of Wyclif's poor priests." They not only obtained popularity among the poor, but were supported and maintained by many among the noble and the rich. By degrees they became so strong that they even ventured to petition parliament to reform the Church in accordance with their theories (1395). It is said that the substance of this petition is contained in the "Lollard Conclusions," in which it is declared that temporal possessions ruin the Church, that the Monk's vow has an effect the reverse of that contemplated, that Transubstantiation is a falsehood, and leads to idolatry, that prayers should not be made for the dead, and that auricular confession was a root of many evils and abuses. They also denounced wars, vows of chastity, trades which pandered to luxurious and extravagant modes of life. In all this they were carrying out the spirit of Wyclif's teaching.

How the matter struck the English laborer in those days we may infer from "Piers Ploughman's Creed," written just before the end of the reign of Richard II., which gives us a "portrait of the fat friar with his double chin shaking about as big as a goose's egg, and the ploughman with his hood full of holes, his mittens made of patches, and his poor wife going barefoot on the ice so that her blood followed." Langland, the author of this poem and the contemporary of Chaucer, was a man of noble and exalted character, deeply sympathizing, as his great poem declares, with the sorrows and sufferings of his age.

It was surely an example of the irony of history when the law for the destruction of Lollardism was passed in the second year of Henry IV. (1401), son of that John of Gaunt, who was the friend and protector of Wyclif. A more disgraceful law never stood on the pages of the statute-book of England than this, *De heretico comburendo*. It was not that this was the first law which made the burning of heretics possible and legal; for at the very time when it was under the consideration of the parliament, the King, under the influence of Archbishop Arundel, had issued a writ for the burning of a Lollard named William Sawtre, after he had been condemned by convocation. But it inaugurated a new course of things, and it bore some miserable fruits in the birth-throes of the Reformation. By this statute it was provided that, if a heretic who had been convicted in an ecclesiastical court refused to recant, he should be handed over to the sheriff to be burned. But the law was made still more severe after the rebellion of Sir John Oldcastle: it was provided further (1414) that the King's justices should have power to seek out offenders and deliver them over to the ordinary for trial, thus giving the initiative to the government. It should be remembered that the passing of these measures was the price paid by the King to the Archbishop and the Clergy for their support of his pretensions to the throne of England. Many burnings were the consequences of these atrocious laws.

It must not be supposed, however, that the papal party had now secured a final victory. In the very year of the accession of Henry IV. to the throne

(1399) it was alleged as one of the accusations against the late King, that he had been subservient to the Roman see, in seeking a confirmation of his acts from the Pope; whereas, they solemnly declared, "the Crown of England, and the rights of the same crown, have been from all times so free, that neither chief pontiff, nor any one else outside the Kingdom, has any right to interfere in the same."

When Martin V. came to the papal throne (1417), he wrote to Archbishop Chichele complaining grievously of the anti-papal statutes passed from time to time by the English parliament, and bidding him see that "that execrable statute [of *Præmunire*] put forth against the liberty of the Church in England"—a view so different from that of those who passed it as a protection of that liberty—"which is opposed to divine and human law and reason may be altogether abolished." The Archbishop was anxious to satisfy the Pope; but the Commons presented a petition to the King, praying him to uphold the liberties of the Church and to resist these papal encroachments. They even went so far as to request that the English ambassadors might be instructed to request the Pope not to continue these aggressions. The Pope most unjustly blamed the Archbishop, and intended to deprive him of his legatine authority. But the Bulls which he despatched for the appointment of another legate were seized and deposited unopened in the royal archives. If these acts of parliament had been as operative as they were definite, the papal authority over England would have become little more than a name. Unfortunately the em-

barrassments of kings, the disorder of the state, the conflicts of parties sometimes threw the one side or the other into the hands of the Pope, sometimes made a watchful care over ecclesiastical affairs almost an impossibility; and the Pope was ever ready to take advantage of such occasions. But the laws for the defence of the liberties of the Church still stood upon the statute book.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.



It is not easy to form a trustworthy estimate of the character of past times. It is by no means safe, for example, to trust to the testimonies of contemporaries. For not only are there in every age the lauders of the past who can see hardly any good in their own times, whilst they attribute to the past qualities created or colored by their own imagination; but we have to be careful of receiving contemporary testimony which may be biased either way by personal or party prejudices. Yet, there are certain sources from which we may derive fairly accurate information, such as the literature of an age and the actual and verified facts of history.

In regard to the fifteenth Century, it is one of the most barren of literature in English history. Yet this very absence of thought and expression is instructive; and it is not without monuments of its own genius. If we compare the products of the thirteenth century or even of the fourteenth, in literature or in art, with those of the fifteenth, we are at once sensible of deterioration. And this deterioration is reflected in the lives and characters of the men of the time of all classes.

To begin with the papacy, the deterioration from the time of great popes like Gregory VII. and Innocent

III. to the time of the "Babylonish captivity" is undeniable and undoubted.¹ Licentiousness and venality had reached such a pitch that Petrarch, who resided near Avignon, speaks of the papal court there as a sink of iniquity and a hell upon earth. Martin V., though insolent and domineering, was respectable. Nicholas V. was more than this, and Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius) was scarcely inferior to him. But Paul II. (1464-1471), who succeeded him, and was the nephew of the excellent pontiff (Eugenius IV.) who reigned between Martin V. and Nicholas V., was arrogant, ostentatious, greedy, unscrupulous, and mendacious. At this time, it was said, every other precious thing was as cheap at Rome as the Pope's oath. His successor, Sixtus IV. (1471-1484) was still worse. In his reign simony was open and undisguised; no benefice was given away without being paid for. His nepotism was shameful and undisguised. Innocent VIII. was no better; as a ruler perhaps worse. Murders were quite common; and if the murderer could pay, he was seldom brought to justice. When an attempt was made to stamp out clerical concubinage by excommunication and suspension of offenders, the Pope put a stop to the proceedings on the ground that it was practically universal. It was Innocent who, for family reasons, made Giovanni de Medici (afterwards Leo X.) a cardinal, when he was only thirteen.

Innocent was succeeded by Alexander VI. (1493-1503), the father of Cæsar and Lucretia Borgia, who

¹ On the contents of this chapter compare the writer's "*Savonarola: His Life and Times.*"

was simply a monster. It speaks volumes for the character of the age, that he seems to have been popular in Rome. Julius II. who succeeded to the papal throne in the year of Alexander's death (the short reign of Pius III. coming between) declared that Borgia was a "scoundrel and a heretic." Julius was the Pope who appeared in armor at the siege of Milan, and he was succeeded (1513) by the "elegant pagan pope," Leo X. So much for the popes of the period immediately preceding the Reformation.

With regard to the secular clergy, they could hardly have been superior to their rulers. If the popes and bishops exacted money from priests and laymen, these must have paid it. It is believed that in England matters were not nearly so bad as in Italy; yet it is clear that they were by no means in a satisfactory condition. Even if the clergy could maintain that those whom the Church called concubines, were in reality their wives, the general effect of such unsanctioned unions must have been, and actually was injurious. Benefices were openly bought and sold; whilst the clergy extorted money from the laity by means of the confessional and the discipline of the Church. Their ignorance was often incredible. Wyclif declared of many of the clergy of his day that they knew not the ten commandments, nor read their psalter, nor understood a verse of it.

Perhaps the saddest monument of the moral and religious decay of the period is found in the state of the religious houses. To this we have already referred, and it is not denied. The debt which the

Church owes to the religious orders and their greatest representatives is incalculable. To the Benedictines of St. Maur, for example, we are indebted for the splendid fruits of their learning in the Benedictine editions of the fathers. Yet we have the most signal and painful proof of the invasion of their monasteries by the spirit of the world in the successive attempts to make the rule more severe. Thus the founding of the reformed Benedictine Monastery at Clugny in the beginning of the tenth Century, and of the order of Cluniacs was a protest against the degeneracy of the Benedictines. And then again, at the end of the eleventh Century, what was counted the luxury and extravagance of the Cluniacs led to the reformed rule of the Carthusians and the Cistercians.

It was even more surprising that the same corruption should have seized upon the friars, since, in their case, not only the individual, but the community, was vowed to poverty. We have seen how Wyclif, originally favorable to the friars, was ultimately opposed to them on the ground of their subserviency to the papacy and their impudent idleness and self-indulgence. Once when he was supposed to be dying, he rallied himself and exclaimed: "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the friars." A century later Savonarola was lending all his gigantic strength to effect a reformation in the great order of St. Dominic—the order of St. Thomas Aquinas and the *Summa*; and the work was almost too great for him.

There is a certain danger in comprehending a whole system in a general condemnation because of the de-

fects or corruptions of particular bodies; and we shall have occasion to remark that some of the religious establishments of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries realized not unworthily the idea and design of their founders; and that, even if the numbers of these houses were excessive, yet in the Middle Ages they subserved most important purposes in respect to education and the relief of the poor; and that some of them were treated with great injustice. It may however, be accepted as an evidence that the monasteries had ceased to satisfy, and also perhaps as a sign of the times, that the charitably disposed now began to found schools and colleges rather than monasteries.

It is hardly necessary to carry our remarks further. There was a lower depth than that of the ordinary secular priests and the regulars, that of the inferior clergy and the chantry priests, whose business was to say masses for the departed. These men, having much time at their disposal, were generally idle and dissipated, and apparently formed the largest number of the clergy.

Among what must be regarded as the abuses of the age are to be reckoned the pilgrimages and the paying of vows at sacred shrines, acts of devotion which became practically compulsory. These practices had been opposed by the Lollards, and Archbishop Arundel had declared that "Holy Church hath determined that it is needful for a Christian man to go a pilgrimage to holy places, and there especially to worship holy relics of saints, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and all saints approved by the Church of

Rome." They were also defended by Bishop Pecock, the celebrated apologist for the clergy of the period.

The value of the pilgrimages was supposed to lie in the indulgences granted to the pilgrims. It is hardly necessary here to say more than a few words on the indulgences which were the immediate occasion of Luther's resistance to the papal authority and of the German Reformation. It is not quite easy to determine the view entertained of the benefits connected with the indulgences by those who were the recipients of them, or the prospects held out by those who sold them. According to the theologians, an indulgence was simply a remission of part of the temporal punishment of sin, generally undergone in purgatory. It was a remission of part of the punishment to be endured by those who were in a state of grace. It could not avail for the impenitent and unbelieving. But it is almost certain that it meant a great deal more than this in the popular mind. If a portion of the stories told in connection with the sale of indulgences in Germany can be relied upon, these indulgences were regarded as conveying at least immunity from all the consequences of sin, apart altogether from the repentance of the sinner, if they did not also give a licence to sin in the future. Here, as in many other cases, such as the invocation of saints and the position assigned to the Blessed Virgin, it is quite clear that there is a wide difference between the teachings of the doctors and the practices of the people.

Without regarding the Church of these times from the point of view of Wyclif, it is yet manifest that,

in various ways, by indulgences to the living and masses for the dead, by appeals to the fears and the hopes of the ignorant, the Church had become the owner of an immense amount of property. This is made quite clear by a consideration of the amount paid by the clergy in taxes, which was nearly one-third of the whole taxation of the nation. Yet, in spite of the influence resulting from their wealth and position, it is quite certain that the power of the clergy was seriously weakened and less able to resist the currents of thought set in motion by the two great movements which had arisen in Western Europe, the revival of letters and the tendency to reformation of doctrine and discipline.¹

¹ It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the words clergy and clerics include not only priests and deacons, but all the minor orders.

CHAPTER VI.

PRECURSORS OF THE REFORMATION—COLET, MORE,
ERASMUS.



ANY causes contributed to the result which we designate the Reformation, among them, the rise of a national spirit, a certain impatience of intellectual control, an indisposition to submit to manifest abuses in the government of the Church, and not least the revival of learning, known as the Renaissance. The spirit of the Renaissance was, indeed, widely different from that which gave an impulse to the reformation movement. Both were of the nature of revolts against the authorities of the period; but the religious revolt was a return to Scripture, the literary revolt was a return to reason and Greek literature and art. It would not be correct to say that the Renaissance originated with the fall of Constantinople in 1483. Long before this, Petrarch (1304–1374), although himself not a Greek scholar, had given a great impulse to the diffusion of Greek literature. But it was undoubtedly the emigration of Greek scholars from Constantinople, at the fall of the Eastern empire, and their settlement in Italy which was the principal cause of the diffusion of that remarkable spirit which took possession of the more reflective

minds in Florence and Italy in the closing years of the fifteenth century. It can hardly be said that Plato displaced Christ, for Christ was by no means King of Florence in the days preceding Politian and Pico della Mirandola and Ficino. Still, unless so far as it came under the influence of Savonarola, the Renaissance in Italy was and remained pagan. It was different with the humanistic movement in Germany; and this may partly account for the different results in Germany and in Italy.

England received an impulse from both quarters. One of the first to bring the new learning thither was John Colet who had come under both the influence of the Renaissance and that of the reforming work of Savonarola at Florence. His lectures at Oxford, differing as they did from the technical methods of the Schoolmen, and taking his hearers straight to the Scriptures themselves, produced a profound impression, and changed the direction of theological studies. At the same time that he was producing a fresh interest in the New Testament, he was urging the necessity of a reform in the lives of the clergy. Both in Italy and in England he had been horrified at the wickedness and profanity of those who sat in high places. From the Pope to the cleric of the lowest degree there must be a change in all. "O Jesus Christ," he prayed, "wash for us not our feet only, but also our hands and our *head*."¹

One of those who came under the influence of

¹His lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, delivered in Oxford, about 1497, have been edited with an English translation by Rev. J. H. Lupton (1873).

Colet was Thomas More, his junior by about fourteen years. He sympathized deeply with his teacher's enthusiasm for learning, and with his zeal for reform, and afterwards became a conspicuous figure in the early days of the Reformation. With them was allied Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, perhaps the most distinguished scholar of his age; and a man so important in reference to the reforming movement that it has been said that, whilst Luther hatched the egg, it was Erasmus who laid it. Colet was born in 1466, Erasmus in 1467, and More in 1480.

Early in life Erasmus was left an orphan, and entered the Augustine Monastery at Steyn where he applied himself to his studies with great energy and success. Finding no sympathy there, however, he left, and by-and-by came to Paris, where he remained until 1498, when he came to England. At Oxford he made friends with Grocyn, who had the chief hand in promoting the study of Greek in England, Linacre, the grammarian, and especially with Colet, who was then teaching in the University. After a year and a half he removed to Paris, and spent six years in France and the Netherlands, writing, while there, his "*Encheiridion*," which was approved by the Principal of Louvain, afterward Pope Hadrian VI., but which was subsequently condemned as heretical by the Sorbonne. In 1506 he is back again in England, taking his degree of B. D. at Cambridge. After visiting various places on the Continent, he returns to England in 1509, where he writes his celebrated *Encomium Morie* ("Praise of Folly," with a passing reference to his friend More). At Cambridge he

lectured on Greek. In 1516 he brought out the first edition of his Greek Testament, dedicated to Leo X. Subsequently he made the acquaintance of von Hutten, the German humanist and friend of Luther, with whom he afterward had considerable disagreements, in consequence, partly, of his refusing to take part in the reforming movement.

Erasmus has been charged with cowardice in standing aloof from the Lutheran Reformation; but there are other explanations, and those more reasonable, of his conduct. Erasmus was a man of a critical turn of mind, and as far as criticism was concerned, he would go all lengths with Luther in exposing the evils of the time, and especially the follies and vices of the religious orders. But it was not only that he lacked the religious enthusiasm of the great German, but he was only partly in agreement with his theology, and wrote a very strong and caustic criticism of Luther's treatise on the Bondage of the Will. Moreover, Erasmus thought it better to strive for the purification of the Church than to effect a rupture in the body. As regards our judgment of Erasmus, we have no reason to suspect his sincerity; and there never has been a doubt of his transcendent ability.

The only important production of Erasmus before the reign of Henry VIII. was his *Encheiridion Militis Christiani* ("Manual of a Christian Soldier") already mentioned, which was, in fact, a very powerful attack on the superstition and formalism of the times. He condemns the adoration of saints and the going on pilgrimages, and denounces the common error of supposing that the mere performance of ex-

ternal duties, and keeping of religious observances constituted a really godly life. If Erasmus was not a builder, he was at least an iconoclast, and prepared material which others might work up.

CHAPTER VII.

EARLY DAYS OF HENRY VIII.



It is hardly possible to approach the history of the early days of the Reformation movement in England without some degree of prejudice. Whether we consider the characters of the prominent persons concerned, or the nature of the incidents upon which important decisions were made to turn, it is easy to see that we are in danger of being diverted from a judgment on the essential meaning of the changes which were introduced in the government of the Church and in her authoritative creed by reflections on the character and conduct of the men by whom they were brought about. It may be as well, therefore, at this point in our narrative, to refer to some of the prejudices which are likely to intrude themselves upon our notice and prevent our forming a just estimate of the meaning of the Reformation movement in England, its causes, incidents, and results.

Naturally a prominent place is occupied by the character of Henry VIII. and his divorce from Catharine of Aragon. No attempt will here be made to defend the character or many of the actions of Henry VIII., or the methods by which he brought about many changes which we regard as in themselves beneficial. Mr. Froude's eloquent apology for the King has indeed brought out more clearly the

fact, that he was, in general, an accurate representative of the sentiments of his people ; but he has produced no permanent change in the judgment of the character of Henry.

Granting that, as he advanced in years, he lost nearly all the charms of his youth, that he became more tyrannical, sensual, selfish, brutal, it is not the character of this man with which we have to deal, but the nature and meaning of the movement which received its most powerful impulse during his reign, but which was brought to completion under his successors. Roman Catholics would be justly aggrieved if we made the character of Boniface VIII. or that of Alexander VI. an argument against the supremacy of the Pope ; and no wise Anglican or Protestant will think of using such an argument. In the same way, we must set it down, once for all, that the character of Henry VIII. has nothing to do with the merits of the Reformation.

Then, again, as regards the divorce, it must be distinctly noted and understood, that the King's contention with the ecclesiastical authorities began long before there was any thought of a divorce ; and further, that the divorce was promoted by men who were Roman Catholics, in the sense of recognizing the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome and holding the distinctive doctrines of the Church which were afterwards rejected by the Reformers.

With regard to the charge of Erastianism brought against some of the methods of the English Reformation, it may be remarked that several of the great councils of early times arrived at their decisions and

decrees under similar influences; yet this has not prevented the Church from accepting them, when they commended themselves to the Christian conscience; and that which concerns those who have to decide as to the merits of the work of the Reformation, is not so much the character of the human instruments by whom it was effected, as the results which they brought about, and the authority by which they are commended to us.

These remarks will enable the reader to understand the point of view from which we regard the history of this eventful period. To enter upon such a study with the fixed determination to find everything bad and wrong on the one side and everything good and right on the other, whichever the side may be, can lead to no result save the strengthening of prejudice, and the shutting out of truth.

No one doubts that changes were necessary in several respects. The moral condition of the Clergy and of the Church at large was deplorable, superstitions and superstitious practices abounded; and the relations between the see of Rome and the national authorities were the source of never ending contention and legislation. It was a matter of accident, at which point the quarrel should break out; but it was inevitable that it should come, and that the elements just specified should be involved in it.

Henry VIII. was barely eighteen years of age when he came to the throne of England (April 22, 1509) and he was endowed with many qualities which at once commended him to the admiration and esteem of his people. He was handsome in

feature, of a noble presence, and attractive in manners, originally too of a generous spirit, however sadly it may have become deteriorated through sensuality, passion, and self-will. He was also a man of very great intellectual ability, with a scholarly mind and no small store of learning. Moreover, he was a man of high courage and skilled in all manly sports. If we think of these endowments and of his youth, we shall understand the enthusiasm with which his accession was greeted by a people who had grown very weary of the parsimony and greed of his father and the extortions of his subordinates. Nor must we forget that, with all his faults and vices, Henry VIII. did largely retain, to the end of his life, the confidence of his people, although he often sorely tried their trust and patience.

Very early in his reign Henry chose as his counsellor, Thomas Wolsey, born at Ipswich, in 1471, and at the time of Henry's accession, thirty-eight years of age, and Dean of Lincoln. He speedily rose to the highest influence and authority, becoming Archbishop of York in 1514, and holding several other great offices *in commendam*. Shortly afterwards (1515) he was raised to the Cardinalate and made Lord Chancellor of England, in the place of Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, who resigned: he was also made the Pope's *Legatus a latere*, first for certain terms and afterwards for life.

Wolsey was a great man, not without serious faults, being fond of magnificence and splendor, and not always scrupulous as to the means which he employed. If his greatest fault was his subserviency

to the King, it is not easy to see how he could otherwise have preserved his place and power. Henry might take counsel with his great minister, and in his early days was greatly under his control; but there is no reason to think, that, when he had formed his purpose, he would have been swayed from it by the judgment or persuasion of Wolsey or any one else.

Mention has been made of the corrupt condition of the Clergy; and a very remarkable testimony on this subject is found in the sermon preached before the Convocation of Canterbury, in the December of 1512, by Colet, now Dean of St. Paul's. Every form of evil he declared to be rife among the priesthood. Clergymen ran almost out of breath from one benefice to another, from the less to the greater. Not only this, they also gave themselves to feasts and banquets, were addicted to hunting and hawking. Nor were they less remarkable for their covetousness. It was a terrible indictment. If these were the shepherds, what must the flock be? Better than the shepherds, it is said; but this must always be doubtful, unless, as Colet suggests, they had excited the indignation and disgust of the laity.

One of the grievances felt by the people at large was a privilege of which we have already heard more than once, the "Benefit of Clergy," that is their exemption from trial by the ordinary civil courts. Once more, under Henry VIII., an attempt was made to put an end to this abuse; the House of Commons passing an act which forbade benefit of clergy to ecclesiastics found guilty of sacrilege, mur-

der, or robbery. The Lords having thrown out the bill, it was modified by the Commons—bishops, priests, and deacons being exempted from its operation; and in this form it became law (1513).

A remarkable incident occurred about this time in the murder in prison of Richard Hunne, a merchant tailor of London, who had been committed on a charge of heresy. The clerical party contended that it was a case of suicide: the jury pronounced it to be a murder, and found Dr. Horsey, the Bishop of London's chancellor, an accessory. Several disputes got mingled. Richard Kidderminster, Abbot of Winchcombe, in a sermon at Paul's Cross, made an attack on the recent Act of Parliament, declaring that the restriction thereby of the privileges of the Clergy was "against the law of God and the liberties of the Church;" producing at the same time a Decretal which affirmed the immunity of clerics from secular control in criminal cases. The case was argued before the King, the Act being defended by Dr. Henry Standish, Warden of the Observant Franciscans. His argument was that no Decretals had effect in England unless they had been legally ratified.

Parliament and Convocation were now arrayed against each other (1515). The latter summoned Dr. Standish to defend his contention. Standish appealed to the King, as having been employed by him. Henry heard the case at Blackfriars. Standish was supported by Dr. Vesey, Dean of the Chapel Royal; and they contended that no canons of the Church were binding in any country until they had

been received there. The judges decided that Convocation, in trying Dr. Standish, had rendered itself liable to the penalties of Præmunire. The Convocation, while throwing itself upon the mercy of the King, indicated the dissatisfaction of its members with this invasion of their privileges. Subsequently they explained that they had not cited Standish for what he had said as King's Advocate, but for his utterances at other times. The King made it quite clear that he understood the merits of the case, and warned the clergy that, as in past times the Kings of England had no superior but God, so he would in like manner maintain all the rights of the Crown. The case is one of considerable importance, more especially as it shows the King's estimate of the relations of the Crown and the Clergy, and so of the papacy at a time when he was a devoted Roman Catholic in the fullest sense of the word.

The movement against Rome was, so far, political and social, and not at all doctrinal; but it was not long before the reforming opinions began to become current among the people. Luther posted his Theses against the traffic in papal indulgences at the door of the Church at Wittenberg in 1517; and in 1520 he published his letter to the "Christian Nobility of Germany" and his "Babylonish Captivity of the Church." Many circumstances tended to make the people of England sympathize with the protests of Luther. The old feeling of independence, their impatience at the claims of the clergy for exemption from the civil courts, their dissatisfaction with the multiplication of Church Courts, and

probably some undercurrent of Wycliffian opinion and sentiment, combined to make them more ready to give a hearing to the new opinions, even if they were denounced as heretical.

The "heresies of Luther" began to spread in the University of Oxford, and to cause serious alarm to the bishops. Warham, as Chancellor of the University, wrote to Wolsey as papal legate, on the circulation of unlicensed books, which were contaminating both of the Universities. The danger spreads. A monk of Bury S. Edmund's preaches, at Oxford, a sermon, in which he rails against cardinals and bishops, and even defends some of the opinions of Luther. Wolsey was wise enough to know that the persecution of men accused of heresy was likely to spread their opinions; but he could not help himself. So, in concert with some Oxford divines, he drew up a declaration condemnatory of Luther's doctrine, and caused it to be posted on St. Mary's Church. He also issued a proclamation requiring that all books by Luther should be sent to the bishop of the diocese, and then to himself. A number of the books were subsequently burned at Paul's Cross, Wolsey being most unwilling to proceed against the persons of heretics, and hoping that this might answer his purpose.

Luther's tract on the Babylonian Captivity of the Church is of special interest to our subject, since it called forth King Henry's book in reply (1521), being an "Assertion of the Seven Sacraments against Martin Luther." The Pope received the book with great joy, pronouncing Luther to be "a most filthy

monster," and, bestowing upon the author the proud title still borne by the British Sovereign, *Fidei Defensor*, "Defender of the Faith." It is not necessary here to dwell upon the King's book or the Reformer's reply. The violence of both may be accounted for by the taste of the times. The chief reflection induced will probably be a sentiment of satisfaction that these fashions have passed away. Among the faults of Wolsey his enemies could never with justice attribute to him a vindictive or persecuting spirit; and he did his best to repress in others the desire to put down the new opinions by mere force. It was not that Wolsey was less faithful to the established doctrines than the other bishops, although he was certainly better disposed to the new learning; but his hope lay in the deepening of knowledge, and in the spread of learning, especially among the clergy; and to this aim he was ever constant.

Clement VII., at his appointment to the papacy, had made Wolsey legate for life (1523); and the latter took the opportunity of getting the Pope's sanction to the appropriation of certain monastic funds for the establishment of Cardinal's College at Oxford. In the formation of the college body, a number of Cambridge men were brought over, most of whom were tainted with Lutheran views. One of them shortly left to join Tyndale who had gone to Germany with the view of producing a translation of the New Testament. The book was at last printed at Cöln and Worms, and was published at Worms in 1526 anonymously. Great numbers of copies

were sold in England, in spite of the attempt of the ecclesiastical authorities to seize and destroy them. The burning of the books (1527) was a boon to Tyndale, as it enabled him to bring out another and more accurate edition of his work. In most cases those found in possession of the translations were merely required to carry a faggot in the procession.

The case of Bilney and Arthur was more serious (1527). These men were not heretics in the sense of assailing the doctrines of the Church, or the sacrament of the Altar in particular; but they were unmeasured in their denunciation of the popular superstitions of the time, pilgrimages, saint-worship, the veneration of relics and shrines, and the like. And they were summoned to answer to charges before Tunstall, Bishop of London. Arthur gave in at once. Bilney, at first, defended his opinions; but afterwards recanted, and was absolved. Returning to Cambridge, he became convinced of his disloyalty to his convictions, and again began to preach against superstitions. He was condemned, as a relapsed heretic, by the Bishop of Norwich, and was burned in that city. There seems to be no truth in the assertion that he recanted again before his death.

CHAPTER VIII.

HENRY AND CATHARINE.

HE facts concerning the divorce of Henry VIII. from Catharine of Aragon are now so well known and so fully attested that very few points remain undecided, and these are of little practical importance. Arthur, the elder brother of Henry and the first husband of Catharine, died in 1502, when Catharine was only seventeen and Henry not twelve years of age. It is believed that it was unwillingness, on the part of Henry VII., to pay back Catharine's dower that made him first conceive the idea of marrying her to her husband's younger brother. The boy prince was, therefore, almost at once betrothed to Catharine, and soon after his father's death, they were married in 1509, he being eighteen and the princess twenty-four. Apparently he had no repugnance to the match, for which a dispensation had been somewhat unwillingly granted by Pope Julius II. This dispensation was of a very comprehensive character, declaring the legality of the marriage to Henry, even in case of the union with his brother having been consummated.¹ Henry and Catharine seem to have

¹ It is perhaps necessary to note this point, as it is often discussed in the proceedings. Bishop Burnet gives his reasons for believing in the consummation. Queen Catharine denied it. But the Pope's dispensation provided for either case.

lived quite happily together for a good many years. She bore him two sons, both of whom died. Her third child was the Princess Mary, afterwards Queen of England.

It has been vigorously maintained that the death of his children and the failure of Catharine to give him a male heir to the crown worked on the King's conscience and made him doubtful of the lawfulness of his marriage with his brother's widow. On the other hand, this idea has been ridiculed as very unlikely to occur to a man of Henry's character, and it has been justly pointed out that these scruples had no existence until after Henry had fallen in love with Anne Boleyn. It must indeed be conceded as a simple fact that these scruples were unknown until Anne Boleyn appeared on the scene; yet it is quite possible that Henry was not entirely hypocritical in assigning his scruples of conscience as a reason for seeking a divorce. If, however, it be true, and it seems probable, that Anne's sister Mary had been the King's mistress before, and this did not seem an obstacle to his union with Anne, his scruples cannot possibly have been very deep.

There seems to be some doubt as to Wolsey's part in the affair at the beginning, some alleging that he rejoiced at the thought of giving offence to Spain and drawing closer the alliance with France. Others, however, maintain that he was at first averse to the divorce, and besought the King to abandon the idea; until, finding that he was thoroughly set upon it, he gave in his hearty adhesion. It was by his advice that various methods were tried for bringing about the

fulfilment of the King's design—not so much to get rid of his wife as to get possession of Anne Boleyn.

First a collusive suit before the legate was thought of (1527); but this fell through. Then the King endeavored to work upon the fears of the Queen, representing that they had been living in sin, and that his conscience would not allow him to continue the connection. Catharine is one of the few persons connected with these transactions whom the candid student of the period can regard with almost unqualified satisfaction. Her position was clear and consistent throughout. She could have no scruples as to the lawfulness of her union. She told the King she could take God to witness that she had always been a true and loyal wife. "God knows," she said, "that when I came to your bed, I was a virgin, and I put it to your own conscience to say whether it was not so." Here, surely, was an end of the scruples. But Henry was resolved on marrying Anne Boleyn, who played her part with great skill, giving the King such encouragement as would lead him on, yet modestly keeping him at a reasonable distance, that he might clearly understand the conditions on which he could gain possession of her.

Wolsey took care to gain over Archbishop Warham, who had indeed been opposed to the marriage with Catharine from the beginning. He also contrived to keep Queen Catharine apart from Bishop Fisher of Rochester, who was her confessor, and to prejudice the Bishop against her. The Cardinal then proceeded to France to advance the cause; and induced the Pope to appoint himself and another

cardinal commissioners to try the case in England. But the permission was granted reluctantly, and it was found, when examined, to be inadequate.

Another attempt was made by Fox, afterwards Bishop of Hereford, and Gardiner, afterwards of Winchester, to obtain a commission with full powers to deal with the question in England. But the Emperor Charles V. was Queen Catharine's nephew, and the Pope did not dare to offend him (1528). Another plan was devised—namely, to have two commissioners, one to hear the case, and the other to dissolve the marriage. To carry out the latter project a Bull was entrusted to Campeggio by the Pope, which was to be shown to the King and some others, and then to be burned.

Wolsey did his very utmost to hasten the proceedings, but he could not content the King. Nor was he able to remove the scruples of the English bishops on the subject. Nor could the Queen be moved from her fixed intention. The people, too, were commonly on the side of Catharine. At last the legatine court met at Blackfriars, May 31, 1529. The King appeared by counsel, the Queen in person. At a second session both appeared, the King protesting his scruples of conscience, the Queen making her appeal to him in language already quoted. She appealed to Rome and left the Court. At the next session she was pronounced contumacious. Bishop Fisher, who had found out the truth of matters, appeared before the Court and declared his willingness to stake his life on the validity of the marriage. Campeggio found it impossible to proceed, and on

July 23 he pronounced the adjournment of the Court.

Wolsey had done his very utmost for his master, but he had failed, and his doom was pronounced. The great seal was taken from him. By a shameful device he was prosecuted, under the Statute of Præmunire, for holding his Court as legate. The Cardinal was abject in his submission, although his acts had been done in the King's service. He may have felt that he had used too great display in the day of his power, and he offered to surrender all his possessions to his master. A pardon was extended to him, and he was permitted to retain his Archbishopric of York. But here his old influence revived, and the jealousy of his rivals poisoned the mind of the King. His committal to the tower was ordered on a charge of treason. He died broken-hearted at Leicester (1530). On his deathbed he spoke those famous words, not to his servant, Thomas Cromwell, but to the Lieutenant of the tower. He had served his King with all his heart. How he had served his God, that God alone can judge.

There now appears upon the scene a man who was to exercise a profound influence on the fortunes of the Church of England for nearly a generation. Thomas Cranmer was born in Nottinghamshire in 1484, and therefore, at the time of Wolsey's fall, was forty-five years of age. He was a good scholar and a man of extensive learning. The most serious fault found with him was his flexibility in judgment and action. In regard to the divorce he had formed a distinct opinion. He told Gardiner and Fox that



they should obtain the opinions of the Universities of Europe, and act upon them by holding a Court in England. When the King heard of this advice, he exclaimed: "This man has got the right sow by the ear." Cranmer put his plan into writing, and then was sent to Rome by the King to apprise the Pope of his intentions. There he was appointed Grand Penitentiary of England; and from thence he proceeded to the Universities of Italy, to obtain their judgment on the King's cause. Paris was the most difficult to manage, but ultimately decided, as most of the others did, on the King's side. Oxford and Cambridge, in spite of all the influence, and almost intimidation, brought to bear upon them, gave the very unsatisfactory decision, that "to marry a deceased brother's wife, when the matrimony had actually been consummated, was against the divine law." This was not at all what the King wanted; but simply a declaration that the papal dispensation was illegal.

Next comes the Pope's decision to the effect, that, as the Queen had appealed to him, and the King had not appeared, the case could proceed no further. The Pope also remonstrated with the English Parliament which had assumed that the decision of the Universities was on the King's side, and had requested him to act upon it. By way of reply, the King issued a proclamation forbidding any communication on the part of his subjects with the Court of Rome, and making the introduction of papal Bulls punishable with imprisonment. Here the King was

exercising his legal rights. One could only wish that the cause had been better.

The clergy were apprehensive that the measures taken against Wolsey, under the Statute of *Præmunire*, might be turned against themselves and in both of the Convocations they had a majority of votes for the nullity of the King's marriage with Catharine. When Parliament met in January, 1531, it was Sir Thomas More who brought before the House the opinions of the Universities. Twelve of them, including Paris, Orleans, Padua, and Bologna, had declared the nullity of the marriage. The parliament could only reaffirm their own judgment which the Pope had condemned. About this time the King was privately married to Anne Boleyn.

(In August 1532 Archbishop Warham died, and the King nominated Cranmer to Canterbury. With apparent and probably real unwillingness Cranmer accepted the honor which he could not easily have rejected when offered by a man like Henry VIII. The relations to Rome were still indefinite, and Cranmer, perhaps unwisely, followed the usual practice of applying to the Pope for the pall. In doing so he had to take an oath of canonical obedience to the Pope. It is true that he declared that by doing so "he did not intend to bind himself to do anything contrary to the laws of God, the King's prerogative, or to the commonwealth and statutes of the Kingdom;" but this was hardly the sense in which the Pope understood the oath. On March 30, 1533, Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop.

On March 28, 1533, the upper house of the convo-

cation of Canterbury unanimously voted the nullity of the marriage without the qualifying phrase introduced by the universities. The lower house was less pliable, but a sufficient acquiescence was obtained.

On the 8th of May Cranmer opened a court at Dunstable, to which he cited the Queen; and, as she did not appear, she was declared contumacious. After waiting for some days, Cranmer says, "On the morrow after Ascension day I gave final sentence therein, how that it was indispensable for the Pope to licence any such marriages." Queen Catharine received the intimation of what had taken place with the same inflexible resolution she had shown throughout. She would not consent to be called Princess Dowager, she was the wife of the King. A few days later the Archbishop pronounced the validity of the King's marriage to Anne Boleyn and on Whitsunday (June 1, 1533) he, assisted by six other bishops and many nobles, set the crown upon her head. About three months later (September 5, 1533) the Princess Elizabeth was born.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SUPREMACY.



ING HENRY VIII. may be said to have pursued a double course which to the mind of later times would seem to involve a contradiction. On the one hand, he made up his mind to throw off the supremacy of the Roman see, on the other to maintain what we should call distinctively Roman doctrine; and both of these aims he pursued, if not with perfect consistency, yet without any real relinquishment of his plan.

The reforming doctrines were still finding their way into England; and one of the Cambridge men who had been brought to Cardinal's college, John Fryth, became suspected of Lutheranism, but escaped to the Continent and became a fellow-worker with Tyndale. An attack had been made upon the doctrine of Purgatory, and Sir Thomas More, Bishop Fisher, and a brother-in-law of More, had come out in defence. Fryth, after writing in opposition to Purgatory and these its defenders, paid a visit to England, when he was arrested and cast into the Tower. As it was not quite easy to obtain a conviction against him on the ground of his tract, he was inveigled into giving to a visitor a treatise on the Eucharist which he had written during his imprisonment. More wrote briefly in defence of the tradi-

tional doctrine, when Fryth replied with great moderation, yet firmly rejecting the adoration of the Sacrament. An opportunity was given him of escaping; but he declined to avail himself of it. He was condemned by a court of which Cranmer was president, and was burned at Smithfield, July 4, 1533.

More was, at this time, the principal controversialist on the Roman Catholic side, writing against Tyndale and others, but apparently with little of the persecutor's spirit. He had, indeed, ceased to be chancellor when Fryth was burned. One notable person appears among the accused of this period. Hugh Latimer, afterwards the most sturdy of the defenders of the reformed doctrine, was already suspected. In 1532 he appeared before convocation and was required to sign certain articles. It appears that his mind was not yet fully made up, and after some hesitation and delay he signed two of them and was absolved. Again he was accused, and escaped. It is hardly fair to accuse him of cowardice. The reformed ideas were evidently working in his mind; but he had not yet that assured conviction of their truth that could justify him in maintaining them in opposition to the general voice of the Church.

About this time there came a new influence into the government of the country which, for a time, promised to put the Church on the way of doctrinal reformation, or at least to obtain greater toleration for Protestant opinion. This was the work of Thomas Cromwell, who had been among the most devoted of the servants of Cardinal Wolsey, and after his fall had passed into the service of the King, be-

coming his secretary and a privy councillor. Cromwell had, at an early period, made up his mind as to the measures to be taken with the Church. He had been Wolsey's chief instrument in the suppression of some of the smaller religious houses, the funds of which had gone to the building of his colleges. When the correspondence with the Pope in reference to the divorce took place, Cromwell gave it as his opinion that the King should proclaim himself supreme head of the Church instead of the Pope; and by his own authority sanction the divorce. For a time the King adopted other councils; but the policy of Cromwell was yet to take effect. His design was to raise the King to absolute authority in Church and State. It was by his advice that the clergy were brought to obedience in 1531 by threats of the penalties of Præmunire. It was now determined to get the Bishops and Clergy to promulgate the view of the relation of the Pope to the Church which forbade his interference with its government in other lands. That the Pope had no more jurisdiction in England than any other Bishop was to be taught throughout the country and preached at Paul's Cross from Sunday to Sunday. The Act for the restraint of appeals to Rome was ordered to be set up in every Church of the land. The mayor, aldermen, and councillors of the city of London were also to help in making it known, that he who called himself Pope was but the Bishop of Rome, and had no more authority in England than any other Bishop.

In order to give general effect to these principles

the King issued a circular letter to the Justices of the peace, setting forth that the Clergy in their convocations had already recognized him as "Supreme Head, immediately under God, of the Church of England," denouncing all obedience to any foreign jurisdiction, whether of the Bishop of Rome or any other. For this reason, he explained, he had required the bishops of the various dioceses to make known that the jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop was a usurpation, and that the King's supremacy was to be maintained; and that they should remove from the office books of the Church any recognition there occurring of the unlawful claims of the papacy. This letter was issued on June 9, 1534.

The King desired that the magistrates should see that the Clergy carried out his orders; but they had not waited for this incitement. On March 31, 1534, the Convocation of Canterbury declared "That the Roman Bishop has no greater jurisdiction given to him by God in this Kingdom than any other foreign bishop." To the same effect the Convocation of York (June 1, 1534) declared "That the Roman Bishop has not in the Holy Scriptures any greater jurisdiction in the Kingdom of England than any other foreign bishop." The two Universities and the bishops declared on the same side; and it is of interest to remember that Gardiner and Bonner were, at this time, staunch upholders of the Royal Supremacy.

The King and Cromwell were entirely agreed on the question of the Royal Supremacy; but the latter was bent on doctrinal reforms to which the King

was opposed; and this may account for the fact that, after Cromwell's fall, the King's action in this respect was retrograde. One great step was taken by the fulfilment of the promise to provide for the people an English translation of the sacred Scriptures; and Miles Coverdale's version, produced with the help of Tyndale, was published in October, 1535. The translation was still from the Vulgate. In the same year the first reformed book of private devotions, called the Primer, was put forth. It condemned certain superstitious practices, yet did not entirely forbid the invocation of Saints. In connection with the progress of reformed opinion, it should be mentioned that, in 1534, fourteen Anabaptists were found guilty of heresy and burned, two at Smithfield, and the rest throughout the country, as a warning! Among those who opposed the divorce and the reformation one should be mentioned, not so much for her own sake, as for the manner in which she was used by others. This was Elizabeth Barton, the "Nun of Kent," at first apparently a pious but hysterical woman, whose fits were regarded by some as a kind of divine ecstasies. These were displayed in public by two designing men, her own parish priest named Master and a Canon of Canterbury called Bocking, who made money by them. Among other "revelations" she spoke by pretended inspiration against the divorce. More examined her and recommended her to keep clear of such questions. Fisher, unfortunately, believed not merely in her sincerity, but in her prophetic gifts as well. It was one of the few errors that Fisher committed.

The nun afterward confessed that she had no real visions. We can quite understand that her own hallucinations might be so mingled with the suggestions of her prompters that she might find it difficult to distinguish and form a judgment upon them. She, her two guides, and others implicated were executed for treason; and Fisher had a narrow escape. The misguided woman confessed her fault at her death; but said truly enough that those "learned men" were more to be blamed than she, having much praised her, and led her to imagine that it was the Holy Ghost who spoke by her, so that she "being puffed up with their praises, fell into a certain pride and foolish fantasy," and thought she might feign what she would.

Among the very worst of the actions of Henry VIII. was the passing of two measures, both in 1534, one the Succession Act and the other the Treason Act. The Succession Act was to legalize the oath already prescribed and taken to insure the succession to the throne of the children of Queen Anne. Refusal to take this oath on the part of More and Fisher was punished with forfeiture of their property and personal liberty to the Crown. The Treason Statute, known as the Verbal Treason Act, made it high treason to be silent. It was construed as "malicious silence," and was to be punished with death. Under this law the monks of the Charterhouse were destroyed, ten being put to death, and the rest dying in prison or being dispersed.

The King's animosity against More and Fisher never slumbered; and it is impossible for his most

ardent advocates to defend his conduct in this case. It would not be difficult to show that Fisher was imprudent, and that More had been inconsistent. As chancellor, he had at least officially brought the question of divorce before parliament. Like other men of his time, he had taken part in persecution. But the real offences of the men were their doubts about the divorce and the Royal supremacy. While the King was meditating how best to proceed against them, his anger was inflamed by the Pope (Paul III.) conferring upon Fisher the Cardinal's hat (May, 1535); and he determined no longer to put off his revenge. Every means was taken to entrap the bishop and the ex-chancellor into expressions which might be used against them. There seems to be some confusion in the reports of their utterances, but the general outcome of the conflict is clear enough. More and Fisher were willing to accept the settled order of things. They would acknowledge Anne as Queen and her children as successors to the throne; they would live quietly under the changed order in Church as well as in State. But they would neither commit themselves to any formal opinion in regard to the King's first marriage and the divorce; nor would they consent to the substitution of the royal Supremacy for that of the Pope. Silence was of no avail in such a case. It was "malicious silence" and treason. Fisher was condemned June 12, and executed June 22, in his eightieth year; and More followed. Every attempt was made, by Cranmer and others, to induce More to take the oath of Supremacy. The story of his last

days, of his determined refusal and cheerful contemplation of the alternative before him, has often been told. He was but fifty-five years of age, but life was not so dear to him as honor. His judicial murder took place July 6, 1535.

It was now war to the knife between the King and the Pope. When the latter found how little he had advanced his cause by the favor he had shown to Fisher, he proceeded to meet violence with violence. He drew up a Bull of excommunication against Henry, declaring him deposed, and laying the Kingdom under an interdict. But the days of King John had gone by and were not to return. The Bull, kept back for a time by the influence of the French King, was not actually launched until 1538. Still the feeling on the continent was so strong that Cromwell took pains to explain to some of the foreign powers, with whom he wished the English government to stand well, the reasons for what had been done.

It was about this time that a controversy took place on the Royal Supremacy between Cardinal Pole on the one side, and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, supported by Bonner, then Archdeacon of Winchester, on the other. This controversy is not only of importance in itself, but it is eventful as having led to one of Henry's worst crimes, the judicial murder of the Countess of Salisbury. This lady was the daughter of the Duke of Clarence; so that Pole and the King were second cousins. The King had a great favor for his relative and in many ways showed this favor by giving him various ecclesiastical offices.

Henry had been greatly disappointed at Pole's refusal to help forward the matter of the divorce, and it became unsafe for him to remain in England. While living in Italy he wrote a treatise on "Ecclesiastical Unity" in reply to a defence of the Royal Supremacy by Dr. Sampson, Dean of the Chapel Royal, which gave still greater offence, and rendered it impossible for him to return to England. He got a Cardinal's hat, but lost his English benefices and was declared guilty of treason. Gardiner replied to Pole in a treatise "On true obedience," maintaining that the King was supreme over all national affairs, ecclesiastical as well as civil. "He is a prince of his whole people, not of a part of it, and he governs them in all things, not in some only; and as the people constitute the Church in England, so he must needs be the supreme head of the Church, as he is the supreme head of the people." Truly the leaders on both sides in the Reformation conflict were about equally disqualified from twitting their opponents with inconsistency or fickleness. In the case of Gardiner, as in that of Cranmer and Wolsey, allowance must be made for the imperious will of Henry, which seemed to have the power of beating down all opposition.

It might be supposed that the Royal Supremacy was now adequately asserted, enforced, and acknowledged; and that, the King being recognized as "over all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil Supreme," the controversy might cease. But unfortunately the King was not contented to administer the laws of the Church: he wanted to make his own will felt di-

rectly, through the whole Church ; and he began to devise measures to this end. The work was begun by the appointment of Cromwell as Vicar-General (1535), and his commission, on the King's behalf, "to treat and examine all causes ecclesiastical, and to exercise, provide, and exert all and all manner of jurisdiction, authority, or power ecclesiastical, which belongs to him as supreme head." The commission was so extensive that it gave the Vicar-General or those appointed by him power to visit all the Churches, and make inquiry respecting their incumbents, whom they might suspend or deprive. They might also make laws for the government of religious houses, direct and confirm the election of bishops, and indeed exercise universal and unlimited authority. In addition, the jurisdiction of the bishops in their dioceses was suspended until the visitation should be completed, their jurisdiction being restored to them by royal licence.

It might be said that these measures were a necessary outcome of the theory of the Royal Supremacy. Where so great a change had been made, it might seem necessary to make clear the relations established by the new order of things. But the changes were not, in reality, so great as they might be made to appear. The Pope was declared to be Bishop of Rome only, and not universal bishop ; but his primacy was not called in question. Appeals to Rome were forbidden ; but this had been done repeatedly in former reigns ; and, if the Pope should abstain from fulminating excommunications and interdicts, it might still be found convenient to allow

appeals, in certain cases, to be carried before his court. The facility with which the whole policy of Henry VIII. was reversed under his daughter Mary is sufficient to show how little had been altered in the general machinery of the Church. There was, therefore, no necessity for these sweeping measures. The supremacy of the King should have been exercised, as it had been before, through the lawfully constituted courts, and any changes in those courts should have been made in a regular manner. But this was not the view of Henry or his Minister. With them the Supremacy meant autocracy; and the reign of Henry VIII. became a tyranny.

*

CHAPTER X.

THE RELIGIOUS HOUSES.

REFERENCE has already been made to the condition of the monastic orders in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It was quite certain that some change would be effected either in their number or in their constitution. It was not merely that they had absorbed a very large amount of the property of the country, in many cases alienating the endowments of the parochial clergy, and often without providing for the discharge of their duties; but many of the religious houses had become very corrupt in principle and life. Of these things there can be no doubt at all, there are abundant testimonies to the facts given by those who were deeply attached to the institution of monasticism.

The suppression of the religious houses may, therefore, to a large extent, have become a necessity. Whether it need have been carried so far may, however, be a question; and there is no doubt at all that, in many cases, it was carried out with great injustice and with needless harshness. Nor can it be doubted that those who aided in the work of suppression were largely influenced by greed—the desire of appropriating the possessions of the religious. It may be convenient to have these points in mind when we are considering the progress of the work.

The King's action in the matter was stimulated by his want of money for the defence of the Kingdom; as he was apprehensive of a war with the Emperor.

When it is remembered that there were more than six hundred of these houses in the country, it might have seemed an easy thing to suppress at least a number of them. But the difficulties were considerable. The Abbots and Friars of these houses were often connected with the great families of the land; the buildings, many of them of exquisite beauty, were endeared to the hearts of the people. Moreover, in times ignorant of a poor law, they were almost a necessity for the relief of the destitute.

Something had been done towards diminishing the privileges of the houses by the Acts of Parliament which cut off all departments of the Church from the see of Rome, and so gave to the King the power to abolish concessions made to them by the Pope. But it was determined to carry the matter much further, and the method adopted was to institute a visitation of all the houses by commissioners appointed by the Crown, that is to say, by Cromwell; the principal of the visitors of the monks being Leighton, Lee, and London, Thornton Bishop of Dover being over the visitors of the friars. The visitation began in October, 1535, and ended about three years later.

The instructions given to the Commissioners embraced eighty-six articles, and had reference to the origin, character, rules, and observances of the different foundations. They were required to ascertain whether the members knew their rules, espe-

cially the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and observed them: whether any of them kept any money without the Master's knowledge: whether they kept company with women, within or without the Monastery, or if there were any back doors by which women came within the precinct: whether they had any boys lying by them, and the like. Then with regard to the buildings and furniture, they were to ascertain the state of the fabric and the plate, of the convent seal and the writings of the house, and further, whether hospitality was exercised. In regard to nunneries, they were to ascertain whether any men conversed with the Sisters alone without the leave of the Abbess, whether they had any familiarity with religious men, whether they wrote love-letters, whether the Confessor was a discreet and learned man and of good reputation.

Henry VIII. was not the first to undertake the dissolution of Monasteries. In the year 1532 the Pope issued a Bull for the dissolution of certain monasteries and setting up bishoprics with the funds; and in the following year the Priory of Christ Church near Aldgate was dissolved, and given to the Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas Audley. The Commissioners, therefore, had precedent for their work.

It is extremely difficult to form anything like a trustworthy judgment on the reports of the visitors of the religious houses. Several of them were men of notoriously bad character, and took bribes from the houses which they visited; they do not seem to have taken the evidence, which they collected, in any

regular and formal way; and they probably did their best to return such reports as were expected of them. On the other hand, it is impossible that their statements should have been received and acted upon, some of them without a protest from the inculpated persons, unless there had been a considerable element of truth in the reports. Some of the houses were even dissolved at their own request, either because they were convicted of irregularities or because they were unwilling to have their rules made more stringent. Some examples may be given.

A surprise visit was paid to the Abbot of Langden, and his door being suddenly broken open, his mistress was discovered with him, whilst a monastic habit found in the apartment showed that she passed for a younger brother of the society. Shortly after this discovery, the Abbot and ten monks signed a resignation, representing that the revenue of the house was so diminished and they were so seriously in debt, that it must be ruined temporally and spiritually unless it obtained relief, and therefore they resigned it into the King's hands. This appears to have been the first resignation. A great many of the religious houses are reported as being seriously in debt.

Against a good many of the houses no complaint seems to have been made; but great disorders were discovered in a large number of them. Many asked to be released, because they had taken the vow against their will. Sometimes quarrels had arisen between different factions in a house. In some houses they found tools for coining money. Not

only illicit intercourse between the sexes seemed to be common, but also unnatural vices.

Although the greater Monasteries had been included in the investigation, the King and Cromwell thought it wiser to begin with the smaller ones, many of which were so impoverished by bad management and perhaps also by laxness and indulgence in the collection of their rents, that they had scarcely the means of subsistence. The Bill for the Suppression of Monasteries having less than £200 a year passed into law in February, 1536, and was speedily acted upon.

Whether or not the suppression of these houses can be justified, no defence can be offered for the manner in which it was carried out. All the property of the various societies was seized, the churches and convents were pulled down, and the bells and other materials were all sold. To every "religious man" there were given forty shillings in money and a gown—to begin the world with! To some of them a small pension was assigned, and leave was given to enter another house, until the time for that should come. On the whole, it seems to have been right that these religious houses, or most of them, should be dissolved: the treatment of the inmates was unjust and barbarous.

It is not surprising that a widespread discontent arose. Those who were shocked by the desecration of the sacred places, many of them raised by the ancestors of great families still of influence in the Kingdom, the poor who had always found food and shelter in the religious houses, and the travelers who had

there met with hospitality on their journey, were alike aggrieved. The King and Cromwell did their best to appease the discontent by publishing accounts, undoubtedly exaggerated, of the bad condition of these houses, and by selling the lands of the Monasteries at low prices to the landed gentry of the different localities; but, in spite of this, great discontent arose. A rising took place in Lincolnshire in October (1536), about twenty thousand taking part in it, and complaining among other things of the suppression of so many religious houses. By conciliatory measures this rising was suppressed. But a more serious insurrection, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, took place soon afterwards in Yorkshire. The insurgents were led by Robert Aske, bore a banner embroidered with the five wounds of Christ, and were the representatives of a papal reaction, partly the result of the prevalent discontent, partly stirred up by the scattered monks. Among other things they demanded the restoration of the religious houses, the deprivation of the reforming bishops, the extirpation of heresy, and the restoration, in some form, of the papal authority. The King was so seriously alarmed that it is said, he had thoughts of entering into communication with the Pope with the view of effecting a reconciliation. The insurgents were so numerous that the Duke of Norfolk, sent against them, did not venture to attack them; and the King, taking a course similar to that adopted with the Lincolnshire rebels, proclaimed a general pardon, and promised to summon a parliament for the redress of grievances. The consequences were serious to those who had been

instrumental in stirring up the insurrection. Twelve abbots were hanged, drawn, and quartered for participation in it.

In the following year (1537) there was a second visitation, and this time of the larger houses which had been passed over before. The scope of the inquiry was extended. The visitors were now to see that the treasures of the houses were neither hidden nor made away with. Moreover they were to ascertain their affection to the King and the supremacy, and to discover what cheats and impostures there were in their images, relics, or other "miraculous" things, for which people had been induced to come to their houses on pilgrimages or had brought them great presents; also to find out whether any had taken part in the late commotions.

The Act of Dissolution had given to the King all the religious houses that might voluntarily surrender to him within a year; and so many had dissolved that by the end of 1538 very few of them were left. The Abbots of the greater houses had made little opposition in the House of Lords to the sacrifice of the smaller houses, and now their own turn had come. Different means were employed to bring about their surrender. Some had been implicated in the insurrections, and the terrible charge of treason hung over them. Some had permitted great disorders among the brethren, or had been guilty of the like themselves; and so were glad to escape with a life pension. Some were inclined to the Reformation and ready to break with the old order. Sincerely or otherwise, some accused themselves of great

crimes, confessing that "they had neglected the worship of God, and had lived in idleness, gluttony, and sensuality."

Among the accompaniments of the dissolution of the religious houses came the destruction of images and relics which had been used for superstitious purposes. Dr. London reported from Reading that the chief relics of idolatry in the nation were there, namely, an angel with one wing that brought over the spear's head that pierced our Saviour's side, and many other relics an inventory of which would fill four sheets of paper. Hugh Cook, the Abbot of Reading, was convicted of having sent some of the plate of the Abbey to the rebels in the North, was found guilty of treason, and was put to death.

It may be of interest to mention here some of the relics and images which were exposed, especially of those supposed to possess miraculous powers. There was a figure of the Saviour on the rood at Boxley, in Kent, which moved its head and eyes. This rood was brought to London and exhibited to the populace, where the Bishop of Rochester showed that the movements were caused by the pulling of wires. At Hales, in Worcestershire, a phial was shown which was supposed to contain the blood of our Lord; but it was discovered that the contents were merely colored gum.

Among the monuments of idolatry destroyed at this time the principal was the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury, who was the favorite English saint in the Middle Ages, as is evinced by the amounts offered at the three greatest altars in Canterbury

Cathedral in one year. At the High Altar, the Altar of Christ, £3 2s. 6d.; at that of the Blessed Virgin, £63 5s. 6d.; and at that of St. Thomas £832 12s. 3d. In other years the difference was still greater, and to the advantage of St. Thomas. King Henry had two reasons for detesting the cult of St. Thomas. He was the representative of the successful opposition of the hierarchy to the Sovereign, and the worship of his shrine diverted a large amount of treasure to doing honor to his memory. The shrine was therefore ordered to be broken in pieces and carried away. The gold in and about the shrine filled two chests so heavy that they required eight strong men to carry them out of the Church. The martyr's bones were burned or mingled with those of others (August 19, 1538). His name was struck out of the calendar, and the office for his festival from the Breviary. When the Pope heard of this outrage, he could no longer withhold the Bull of excommunication which he had drawn up against Henry about three years before. He now declared the King of England excommunicated and deposed.

The Act of Dissolution of 1536 having provided only for the suppression of the smaller houses, another was passed in the Spring of 1539, sanctioning and regulating the transfer of those which had taken place. Among the last and saddest of the acts of spoliation was the dissolution of the Abbey of Glastonbury and the judicial murder of its head, Robert Whyting. According to a contemporary letter, he was "arraigned and next day put to execution for robbing of Glastonbury Church." As a

matter of fact, there was no serious charge against him or his community. Their only sin was their wealth, and there was no proof that they spent it unlawfully or mischievously. But Henry wanted their money and regarded them as on the side of the Pope, and resolved on their destruction. Whyting did his best to preserve the property of his Abbey and hid away his money and jewels. For this he was hanged and quartered on Tor Hill (1539). It is not a glorious page in the history of the English Reformation. And now we must go back a little.

CHAPTER XI.

REFORMATION AND REACTION.



It is impossible to read carefully the history of the English Reformation without being impressed by the numerous apparent contradictions and inconsistencies which it discloses. One of the most striking phenomena is the apparent servility of the English people to their sovereigns during this period. That a people so proud, so independent, so ready to resist any encroachment on their liberties, should have been ready to change backwards and forwards, to adopt reforms and to reject them or undo them at the will of the Sovereign may seem almost incredible.

We are here dealing with a subject of great complexity, and a few general remarks may be allowed in this place, leaving the treatment of particular incidents to the places to which they belong. In the first place, the destruction of the nobility during the Wars of the Roses left the sovereign without control, the middle class having not yet risen to importance. Further, it must not be assumed that the people and the sovereign were generally of different minds. Those Tudor sovereigns, masterly and overbearing as they were, yet understood their people and often represented them when they seemed to control them. Moreover, for a long time, the reforming and conservative tendencies seem to have

been so evenly balanced that oscillations of the public mind in either direction might reasonably be expected.

In regard to Henry's reforming action, it must be clearly kept in mind that he had no misgivings at all on the subject of limiting the prerogatives of the papal see. At first, he simply wanted to do what his predecessors had done. He would be supreme over all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil, and would suffer no appeals to be made to Rome without his leave. When he could not have his own way in the matter of the divorce, he cut the connection with Rome altogether. Perhaps he might not have gone so far, if the Pope had not published his Bull of excommunication.

In regard, however, to the reformation of doctrine, Henry was evidently of quite another mind. He was a friend of the new learning, but he had no mind for the principles of the German or the Swiss Reformation. When he was getting possession of the funds of the religious houses, he showed a leaning to those principles which condemned the abuses of which he took advantage. It seems certain too, that he felt the influence of Queen Anne and of Cromwell; but when he began to grow weary of Anne, and Cromwell's authority was on the wane, he recoiled from the reforms which he had begun to sanction, and became reactionary. It is possible, moreover, that the Pilgrimage of Grace may have brought home to him the conviction that there was more vitality in the traditional faith than he had imagined.

In the same year in which the minor Monasteries were dissolved (1536) Queen Catharine died, and soon afterwards came the divorce and the execution of Queen Anne. Henry partly had grown weary of her, partly was disappointed by her having no son : one was born dead in this year. Besides, he had fallen in love with Jane Seymour. It was a shameful business, and does not directly concern us here. The charges against the unfortunate woman were probably all false, none of them could be said to be proved, some of them were utterly incredible. It is one of the dark spots on the history of Cranmer that he proclaimed the divorce of Anne. The King's conduct was as indecent as it was cruel and unjust : the day after Anne's head fell on Tower Green, he married Jane Seymour (May 20, 1536). He next obtained an Act of Parliament, securing the succession of the offspring of Jane, and declaring both Mary and Elizabeth illegitimate.

Some attempt at Reformation in doctrine was made by the Convocation of 1536. Latimer, preaching before this august body, brought some grave accusations against the Clergy, referring to the corruption of the Church courts, the superstitious use of images and pilgrimages, the sale of masses and the like. But the Clergy were not prepared to go all lengths with the reformers. Acknowledging the King's supremacy, they yet complained that great license had crept into the expressions used about the Church and the Sacraments. They also complained that books which had been condemned by Convocation had not been prohibited by the bishops. The

reply, on the part of the bishops to this memorial, was the document known as the Ten Articles, which was intended, on the one hand, to repress the irreverence of some of the reformers, and, on the other, to cast some of the mediæval practices into the shade.

These articles were presented to Convocation by Bishop Fox of Hereford, July 11, and accepted by both houses. They were then published under the title of "Articles devised by the King's Highness' majesty to establish Christian quietness and unity among us, and to avoid contentious opinions: which articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the whole clergy of this realm." These articles, while showing a disposition to drop some of the traditional beliefs and observances, were yet not of a revolutionary character. They declare that the Christian faith is contained in the Bible and the three Creeds, interpreted according to the Doctors of the Church and the "four holy Councils." Of the seven sacraments, three only are explained, Baptism, Penance and the Sacrament of the Altar. Nothing is said of the other four. Baptism is declared to be the means of deliverance from original sin and of obtaining the Holy Spirit. Penance, embracing contrition, confession, and amendment, is declared to be necessary for all who have fallen into deadly sin after baptism. As regards the Eucharist, it is said that under the form and figure of bread and wine is "verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross for our

redemption." The ground of justification is declared to be the merits of the passion of Christ, and its attainment through contrition and faith joined with charity. Images are valuable, if rightly used. Saints are to be honored, but not as God. Purgatory is partly allowed, so far as prayers for the dead are concerned; but any belief in the Pope's power to abridge the period of trial is treated as a superstition.

In these articles we see the presence of tendencies which are apparent throughout the whole history of the English Reformation; and in this regard their contents are of considerable importance. It has been sometimes charged against the Church of England that she takes what is called the *Via Media*, meaning by this that she makes a compromise between the party who clung to the traditional beliefs and those who advocated revolution. Even if this were the case, probability would be on her side. But it may be said with some confidence that history will not bear out this theory. The English reformers, taken as a whole, were neither eclectics nor were they mediators between extremes. They acted and they intended to act upon the principle laid down in the Ten Articles, that the faith of the Church must be determined and tested first by the Scriptures and the Creeds, then by the Fathers and the early Councils of the Church. Here is a clear principle upon which the Church of England professes to base her action, and she has never departed from it. At different times men may have taken somewhat different views as to what was to be regarded as primitive and

permanent in the Creed of the Church; and evidences of these differences are found in her history and in her formularies; but this is a totally different matter from any theory of compromise. Not only is this which may be called the Anglican principle announced in the Ten Articles, it is also practically recognized and illustrated in their contents.

The last session of the Convocation by which the Ten Articles were sanctioned was held in July, 1536; and in October the insurrection already mentioned broke out in Lincolnshire. At the same time an irregular Convocation assembled at York, in evident opposition to the recent doings of the Convocation of Canterbury. They condemned the preaching against purgatory, worshipping of images and saints, pilgrimages and the like. They also declared that no acts of parliament could convey to the King the supreme headship of the Church or the right to exercise any spiritual jurisdiction in the same. This was bad enough, but they further proceeded to declare that lands given to God could not be taken away, and that the Pope was Head of the Church, and that dispensations and indulgences given by him were good and valid. The King met these mutinous protests in two ways. Ultimately they cost some of their promoters their heads, as they were regarded as treasonous; but immediately he took pains, through the bishops, to point out that the Ten Articles in no degree departed from the Catholic faith, and that all "honest ceremonies of the Church" were encouraged and not condemned.

In order to give further effect to the work of refor-

mation a meeting of the bishops of both provinces was held early in 1537, at which a committee was appointed to draw up a book of religious instruction. As a consequence there appeared the work entitled the "Institution of a Christian man" (May, 1537), known as the "Bishops' Book," with the approval of the King. This book contains an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer: also of the "Seven Sacraments;" and of Justification and Purgatory. The Ten Articles are embodied in the book; and the three sacraments there described are declared to be of greater dignity and necessity than the others.

In this year the translation of the Scriptures known as Matthew's Bible (the pseudonym of John Rogers) was printed on the Continent. It had been made up from the portions left by Tyndale, and, as regards the remaining parts, from Coverdale's version, the publication of which had been sanctioned by the King in the previous year. The notes showed a strong leaning to the principles of the Reformation. The book was licenced by the King in much the same way in which the "Institution" had been sanctioned, without his knowing much about its contents. It gave great satisfaction to Cranmer and the reformers. A revision of this translation was printed in England and published in 1539, and was known as the "Great Bible."

Preparations were made for rendering the translation practically useful by the issuing of royal injunctions that a large copy of the whole Bible should be set up in some convenient place within each

Church, where the parishioners might most commodiously resort to the same and read it. At the same time the clergy were admonished not to discourage the reading of the Scriptures, but that they should "expressly provoke, stir, and exhort every person to read the same as that which is the very lively word of God, that every Christian man is bound to embrace, believe, and follow, if he look to be saved."

Among these injunctions were instructions to the clergy to instruct the people in the knowledge of the formularies, when they came to confession in Lent, to preach a sermon once a quarter, containing the pure Gospel and warning them not to trust in pilgrimages, or any other superstitious usages, and forbidding the use of lights in the Church except the light by the rood loft, the light before the Sacrament, and the light about the sepulchre in Holy Week (1538).

Henry VIII., under the influence of Cranmer and Cromwell, had gone as far in the way of reformation as he was prepared to go. It is indeed likely that he allowed them to go so far because he had not very carefully examined the documents which they had issued. But now an attempt was made to effect a confessional union between Anglicans and the German Lutherans, although the King had declared his disapproval of the confession of Augsburg. Moreover a good deal of profane ridicule had been cast by members of the reforming party on some of the old customs which had not been condemned by authority. Henry had wanted to stand well with the foreign reformers on account of his relations

with the Emperor Charles, his first wife's nephew; and therefore he had made concessions which were certainly not to his own mind. But now these negotiations were broken off, and a system of persecution began, directed against those who were departing from the traditional beliefs.

One example of the change of attitude was given in a proclamation, issued in November, 1538, forbidding any priests who had married to minister any sacrament or other ministry mystical, or to hold any office or preferment, and expelling them from the same and regarding them as lay persons. Still worse was the case of one Nicholson, or Lambert, as he had called himself, who had adopted Zwinglian views of the Sacrament of the altar. Being brought before Cranmer, who then held Lutheran views, Lambert, when condemned by the Archbishop, imprudently appealed to the King, who was never unwilling to display his considerable theological learning. Henry told the accused that the words of Christ, "This is my body," settled the question, and the poor man was condemned to the stake. About the same time the King gave out that he did not wish the abolition of Church ceremonies, and exhorted to the observance of those of "holy bread, holy water, processions, kneeling and creeping on Good Friday to the cross, and on Easter Day setting up of lights before the Corpus Christi," and the like. It was evident that reaction had set in.

But the high-water mark of reaction was reached by the passing of the Statute of the Six Articles by both houses of Parliament, at the request of the

King. Henry had been irritated by some of the criticisms, by Lutheran divines in England, of things still tolerated in the Church of England, which they regarded as abuses. Accordingly he brought a series of questions before the House of Lords with reference to certain matters of dispute; as to Transubstantiation, communion in both kinds, vows of chastity, private masses, the celibacy of the clergy, and auricular confession. Cranmer represented the reforming bishops, or men of "the new learning." Those of the "old learning" were represented by Lee of York. Each party drafted a bill on the subject, but neither was accepted. That of the King was ultimately adopted. When the six points were submitted to Convocation (June 2, 1539), they were accepted, Bishops Latimer and Shaxton, and Doctors Crome and Tailour dissenting. When brought into the Lords (June 7) the King wished Cranmer to give his support or absent himself from the house. He would not give his approval, but he desisted from opposition, seeing its uselessness.

The Six Articles agreed upon were to the following effect: (1) That there was a real presence of "the natural Body and Blood of Christ" in the Eucharist; (2) That communion in one kind was sufficient; (3) That the clergy may not marry; (4) That vows of chastity are of perpetual obligations; (5) That private masses were lawful and commendable; (6) That auricular confession is necessary. Whoever opposed the first article was to be burned. Whoever rejected the other five was, for the first offence, to suffer loss of goods and imprisonment, and for the

second, to be hanged. Marriages of priests and of those who had vowed chastity were to be dissolved. Cranmer, who was married, was required to send away his wife. If they married again, they were to be hanged. The act was known as the "Whip with six strings."

The very badness of the act was probably the reason of its comparative ineffectiveness. As many as five hundred were cast into prison, and nearly thirty may have been put to death. "This severe and barbarous statute," as the Roman Catholic Lingard calls it, had this terrible new feature that it left no place for repentance. It declared: "If any person write, preach, or dispute against the first article, he shall not be allowed to abjure, but shall suffer death as a heretic, and forfeit his goods and chattels to the King. Latimer of Worcester and Shaxton of Salisbury resigned their sees; but the latter recanted and was restored. About this time Bonner was raised to the episcopate, first as Bishop of Hereford, and afterwards of London, being like Gardiner of the party of the old learning in doctrine, yet a strenuous maintainer of the royal supremacy.

Reference must here be made to some matters personally concerning the King, since they cannot easily be separated from the story of the Reformation. The principal incident of this period, and one of the most shameful, is what must be called the cruel murder of Cromwell, Earl of Essex. He was the victim of the King's passions and his ingratitude. Cranmer did not exaggerate, when, in pleading for him, he declared that "No King of England ever

had such a servant." He is a man of whose origin little is known, but of whose abilities there can be no question. He was the chief framer of the royal policy in asserting the supremacy and carrying through the Reformation. His chief fault was his having promoted Henry's marriage with Anne of Cleves, whom the King, in the most disgraceful manner, got divorced. He was also detested by many of the nobility, particularly by the Duke of Norfolk, with whose daughter Henry had fallen in love. As Anne Boleyn brought about the fall of Henry's faithful servant, Cardinal Wolsey, so Catharine Howard helped to bring Thomas Cromwell to the block. On the same day that his head fell, the King married Catharine (July 28, 1540). Her triumph was short-lived. She was proved guilty of incontinency before her marriage, and beheaded on Tower Green.

Respecting the great minister of Henry VIII. wide differences of opinion will always prevail. We can quote the words of Burnet without forgetting that another painter has introduced some darker shadows into the portrait: "Thus fell that great minister, that was raised merely upon the strength of his natural parts. For, as his extraction was mean, so his education was low: all the learning he had was, that he had got the New Testament in Latin by heart. His great wisdom and dexterity in business raised him up through several steps, till he was become as great as a subject could be. He carried his greatness with wonderful temper and moderation; and fell under the weight of popular odium rather

than guilt. The disorders in the suppression of abbeys were generally charged on him; yet when he fell, no bribery nor cheating of the King, could be fastened on him; though such things come out in swarms on a disgraced favorite, when there is any ground for them."

Just before the execution of Cromwell the King, on Cranmer's representation of the severity of the punishments for clerical marriages, sanctioned the passing of a statute (July 20) reducing the punishment of death to the forfeiture of benefice and goods. The reactionary party, however, still had the upper hand. Bills of attainder were brought into parliament against three Lutherans, and along with them a number of others, some for denying the supremacy, some for heresies unmentioned, were condemned to death. Henry seemed now to kill without misgiving or reluctance. On May 17, 1541, the Countess of Salisbury was beheaded for no other fault than that she was the mother of Cardinal Pole, who had written against the divorce of Queen Catharine. There was an appearance of impartiality in some of these slaughters—the impugners of Transubstantiation and those who questioned the supremacy being marched to the stake in pairs. But an act passed in January, 1543, was clearly intended to repress the reforming spirit. This act, after pointing out the evils arising from a perversion of the Scriptures, promises that a form of orthodox doctrine shall be set forth, forbids all books contrary to the Six Articles, also the reading of the Bible to all under the degree of gentlemen or gentlewomen. In some points this act

modified the Six Article Statute, exempting the laity from capital punishment for heresy, and permitting the accused to call witnesses. But the King had power to set aside any part of this law, so that the gain was very uncertain.

The boldness of the reactionary party may be judged from an attempt which they made to inflame the King against Archbishop Cranmer. The Archbishop was of a yielding disposition generally, and more especially to the King, hardly ever thinking of crossing his will. Nevertheless he had the interests of the Reformation at heart and did his best to defend and protect those who were charged with holding the reformed doctrines. Some of the clergy of his own cathedral wrote to the King accusing their Archbishop of encouraging heresy in his diocese. The King handed the letters over to Cranmer. A member of the House of Commons accused him of preaching heresy in regard to the Sacrament of the Altar. He found no encouragement, however, from the King, but only a demand that he should apologize to the Archbishop for his offence. But a more serious attack was made upon him and one of special interest because it gave occasion for one of the few scenes in the life of Henry VIII. which the impartial reader can contemplate with satisfaction, a scene described by the historian and adorned by the genius of Shakespeare. As Cranmer is the most prominent figure in the early history of the Reformation, it is worth while to dwell for a moment upon this scene.

It was clear to the reactionary party that they could never have everything as they wished whilst

Cranmer retained the confidence of the King; and so they resolved, if possible, to compass the destruction of the Archbishop, and, with him, of Queen Catharine Parr, who also favored the reformed principles. They therefore represented to the King that there were proofs enough against Cranmer; but that none would venture to bring them forward so long as they thought he was in favor with the King. If, however, he were sent to the Tower, then there would be no difficulty about the matter. The King consented to his being summoned before the Council, and also that he should be sent to the Tower, if they should see cause for that. His enemies now thought him as good as ruined. The King, however, sent for him in the night and told him of the accusations and in what manner he had received them. Cranmer thanked him for the warning, acknowledged the fairness of his action, and said he asked for nothing but to be allowed to answer. The King was astonished at his simplicity, pointing out to him that if he were once sent to the Tower, there would be no lack of witnesses to prove anything. He told him, therefore, to demand, when he came before the council, that his accusers might be brought face to face with him before he was sent to the Tower. If they refused this request, he was to appeal to the King, showing the royal signet as his warrant. The King gave him the ring and sent him privately home.

Next morning Cranmer was summoned before the council. He went at once, but was kept waiting for some time in the ante-chamber. Dr. Butts, the

King's physician, went and told the King what a strange thing he had seen: "the Primate of all England waiting at the council door among the footmen and servants." The King immediately sent word that the Archbishop should be admitted, which was done. He was then informed of the charges against him, to the effect that all the heresies in England came from him and his chaplains. To all this he answered as the King had directed. But they were set upon carrying out their plan of sending him to the Tower. Expressing his regret at being so used by those with whom he had sat so long at that board, he said that it had become necessary for him to appeal from them to the King, at the same time to their great confusion showing them the ring.

When they appeared before the King, he rebuked them for their treatment of the Archbishop. He declared "by the faith he owed to God," that, if a Prince could be indebted to his subject, he was to the Archbishop, and that "he took him to be the most faithful subject that he had, and the person to whom he was the most beholden."

The Duke of Norfolk, the leader of the opposite party excused himself by saying, "they meant no harm to the Archbishop, but only to vindicate his innocency by such a trial, which would have freed him from the aspersions that were cast upon him." To this the King made answer, "that he would not suffer men that were so dear to him to be handled in that fashion. He knew the factions that were among them, and the malice that some of them bore

to others, which he would either extinguish or punish very speedily." Burnet places this incident in the year 1546, as having happened after the death of the Duke in August, 1545. As, however, Dr. Butts died in November of that year, it must be placed between August and November. Burnet says, the reconciliation which the King brought about was quite sincere on Cranmer's part, "though the other party did not so easily lay down the hatred they bore him."¹

These plotters were not content to be so foiled, and made another attempt, this time directly against the Queen who in various ways showed favor to the party of reform. So long as the King was satisfied with her in other respects, he paid no attention to the rumors of her hearing sermons from the reforming teachers. When, however, she began to argue these questions with the King himself, he became alarmed and communicated his sentiments on the subject in the presence of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester; "and he," says Burnet, "craftily and maliciously struck in with the King's anger, and said all that he could devise against the Queen, to drive his resentments higher; and took in the Lord Chancellor with the design to assist him."

As a consequence articles were drawn up against Queen Catharine and signed by the King. But the paper, being accidentally dropped by the Lord Chancellor, came into the Queen's hands. Though much alarmed, yet by the advice of one of her friends she

¹ Burnet, *Reformation*, Part I. Book III. Shakespeare places the incident a good deal earlier, for dramatic reasons.

went to see the King, who received her kindly and began a conversation on the subject of religion. She was too wise, however, to place herself, as a controversialist, on a level with her husband. Women, she said, were by their first creation made subject to men, and therefore should learn of them; "and she much more was to be taught by his Majesty, who was a prince of such excellent learning and wisdom." "Not so, by St. Mary," said the King. "You are become a doctor able to instruct us, and not to be instructed by us." She assured him that "he had much mistaken the freedom she had taken with him, since she did it partly to engage him in discourse, and so put over the time and make him forget his pain; and partly to receive instructions from him, by which she had profited much." "And is it even so?" said the King, "then we are friends again." So, says Burnet, he embraced her with great affection, and sent her away with very tender assurances of his constant love to her. Next day the Lord Chancellor came with a guard to conduct her to the Tower. "But," says Burnet, "the King stepped aside to him; and after a little discourse he was heard to call him knave, fool, and beast, and he bade him get out of his sight. . . . So this design miscarried; which, as it absolutely disheartened the papists, so it did totally alienate the King from them, and in particular from the Bishop of Winchester, whose sight he could never after this endure. But he made a humble submission to the King; which though it preserved him from further punishment, yet could not restore him to the King's

favor." Lingard says that some have supposed that the whole scheme was of the King's contrivance, to wean his wife from an attachment to the dangerous doctrines; but there does not seem sufficient reason for this suggestion.

It is said that the books which the Queen had studied came from Anne Bocher and Anne Kyme, the latter better known by her maiden name of Anne Askew. This was a lady of a good Lincolnshire family, of distinguished worth and beauty, who had become convinced of the error of Transubstantiation. Compelled by her husband to leave her home, she was charged with heresy, "for that she was very obstinate and heady in reasoning on matters of religion." When in prison she wrote to the King that "as to the Lord's Supper she believed as much as Christ Himself had said of it, and as much of His divine doctrine as the Catholic Church had required." These statements were regarded as evasions. She was put on the rack in the hope that she might incriminate others, but nothing could be extorted from her, although she had been so tortured that she was unable to stand upright, and had to be carried in a chair to Smithfield, where she and four others were burned at the stake, July 16, 1546. Shaxton, who had been deprived of the see of Salisbury, had recanted, and preached the sermon at the execution, expressing his compassion for heretics, and exhorting them to follow his example.

We have already mentioned the translation of the Bible and the placing of copies in the churches; and also the publication of the Primer in 1539. An

edition of this book revised by the King was put forth in 1545. But it was thought necessary to provide something better in the way of religious instruction than the Bishops' Book (*Institution of a Christian Man*), and a commission was appointed for this purpose. The outcome was the "King's Book," the *Necessary Erudition of any Christian Man* (1542), in which the doctrine of Transubstantiation is stated more strongly than in the earlier book, whilst the royal supremacy is also more forcibly maintained. The book was approved by Convocation.

In the following year a revision of the different office books of the Church was undertaken, but nothing considerable was achieved during this reign. By direction of the King, Cranmer prepared (1544) a free English version of the Litany, which came at once into use. On St. Luke's Day, October 18, the choir of St. Paul's sang this English Litany in procession, the King having enjoined its use in every parish church every Sunday and festival day.

There can be no doubt that, in doctrinal conviction, Henry VIII. inclined much more to Gardiner and the men of the old learning than to Cranmer and those of the new; so that there was great uncertainty as to his final arrangements for the future government of the Kingdom. Although not an old man—he was under fifty-six when he died—he had become so feeble and unwieldy that he had to be taken up and downstairs by machinery. He was induced, however, to have his will made, and, in doing so, he not only left out the name of Gardiner, whom in a previous testament he had nominated as

one of the executors, but otherwise made such a disposition as showed his unwillingness to give the reactionary party control of his son Edward, whilst he did not show special favor to the Reformers. Cranmer and Tunstall, now of Durham were the two Bishops appointed among the sixteen Councillors who were to have the guidance of the young King, until he was eighteen years of age. Lord Hertford, Edward's uncle, belonged to the reforming party, but Wriothesley, the Chancellor, was of the other. In spite of this, the real weight of influence remained with the reformers.

Among the last acts of Henry's life was the command to arrest the Duke of Norfolk and his son, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, the poet, on a charge of treason. They had borne the arms of Edward the Confessor, claiming a right to do so, and had been guilty of other imprudences. Surrey was executed on January 27, 1547. His father was to have been put to death on the following day, but the King died in the morning, and he was taken back to prison.

The summary of Burnet is well considered. Henry VIII., he says, "is rather to be reckoned among the great, than the good princes. He exercised so much severity on men of both persuasions, that the writers of both sides have laid open his faults and taxed his cruelty. But as neither of them were much obliged to him, so none have taken so much care to set forth his good qualities, as his enemies have done to enlarge upon his vices. I do not deny that he is to be numbered among the ill princes, yet I cannot rank him with the worst."

On one point there need be no hesitation in expressing an opinion. It is utterly absurd to suppose that the character of Henry VIII. reflects any disgrace or discredit upon the principles of the Reformation. Henry VIII. had no sympathy whatever with the reformation of doctrine. Although strongly anti-papal, in his religious convictions he was mediæval and Roman.

CHAPTER XII.

EDWARD VI. AND THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK.

ENRY VIII. was not only practically absolute during his life: he was allowed to regulate the succession to the throne after his death; and the disposition which he made was undisturbed. Naturally enough his only son was appointed to succeed him; and, in case of his dying without heir, his elder sister Mary was to come next, and after her Elizabeth. In case of the failure of heirs to all of them, the descendants of his elder sister, Margaret, were to be passed by, and those of his younger sister, Mary, to succeed.

In describing the events of the reign of Edward VI. it has been common for writers on the one hand to select one or the other of the two Prayer Books of the period, as representing the true spirit of the Reformation; and, on the other hand, to work up to a kind of climax in the reign of Elizabeth, which is regarded as the "Reformation Settlement." Such a treatment of the subject is the work of an advocate, not of an historian. Every student of theology and of history has his convictions and his preferences; and it would be easy enough to conduct an argument by way of proof that either of these books approached perfection, and that either the purification of the earlier book was incomplete, or that the offices were mutilated in the later book. If our object were to

counsel a fresh revision of the Prayer Book, remarks of this kind would be in place. As our business is quite different from this, we shall endeavor to trace the succession of events as they occurred, we shall try to understand the influences under which changes were made, and the significance which they were intended to bear; and in that way we shall probably afford the best assistance to our readers in forming their judgments on those other points. Moreover, unless we are mistaken, it will become evident that, amid all the superficial differences and all the widely separated agencies in the work of the Reformation, there was not only a singular unity of tendency, but the evidence of an overruling Providence which was shaping the work to its end amid all the rough hewing of its human agents.

Edward VI. was only nine years of age when he came to the throne, so that his father had appointed sixteen Councillors to guide him, foremost among whom were his uncle, Seymour, Earl of Hertford, great Chamberlain; Lord Wriothesley, Lord Chancellor; and Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. According to Henry's will the Councillors were to have equal power, and on the day of the proclamation of King Edward they took an oath to "maintain the last will and testament of their Master, the late King, and every part and article of the same to the uttermost of their power." In spite of this it was immediately pretended that it was necessary to appoint one of the council to transact business with the ambassadors of foreign powers, and, notwithstanding the opposition of Wriothesley, the proposal was

carried, with the understanding that the person appointed should not presume to act without the consent of the majority of the council. Hertford was immediately elected to be Protector of the realm and Guardian of the Person of the King, and created Duke of Somerset. Hertford was not a man of great ability nor yet of high principle. Yet he was a man of tolerably strong convictions, a Protestant of the Swiss type, rather than the German, and an Erastian. He did his best to give effect to these convictions when he became practically the head of the government of England.

By way of asserting the royal supremacy, the bishops were required to take out new licences from the crown. By this requirement, which had been enacted under Henry VIII., it was not intended to assert any spiritual authority on the part of the Sovereign; but merely to declare that the bishops derived their jurisdiction from the crown. Shortly before the death of Henry VIII. an act had been passed, making over to the King the lands of all Chantries, Hospitals, and Guilds. A Bill was now brought in conferring the same privileges upon his son. These measures affected only the external relations of the Church.

Soon, however, it became manifest that the state of things under Henry VIII. was not to remain undisturbed. Somerset, seconded by Cranmer, was resolved on serious changes. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of Cranmer. Under Henry VIII. he had been weak and compliant; yet in matters on which he had strong convictions he had not hesitated

to declare to the King his inability to consent to some of his measures. He would obey, or at the least be silent, but he would not approve. Cranmer was always a conservative reformer, differing from that class who went back simply to the Bible, which meant their own opinions. Cranmer stood on the Bible as interpreted by Catholic antiquity. That his opinion should have become modified by time, study, and circumstances, is nothing to be wondered at. He was a man of wide learning and of unfeigned piety; but he was not a man of great strength of will. It could never be said of him that he used his office or his opportunities for self-aggrandizement, and his gentleness and mercifulness passed into a proverb. He had gone from mediæval doctrine to Lutheranism; and at the accession of Edward VI. he seemed to be veering toward the Swiss type of reformation.

A conflict soon arose between the two parties. Ridley, who was at this time chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, in a sermon delivered in Lent, had suggested the destruction of sacred images. A number of fanatics, kept down by the imperious will of the late King, were now ready to break out. Bishop Gardiner, true to the position he had taken, came forward in defence of the observances in use, contending that the royal supremacy was personal, that it could not be exercised by the council, and therefore, that no changes should be made during the minority of Edward VI. This theory did not at all comport with the designs of the Protector, who resolved upon a general royal visitation of the whole Kingdom, divided into six circuits.

The visitors appointed were partly clergymen and partly laymen; and during their visitation the powers of the Bishop were suspended. They administered the oaths of allegiance to the Bishop, the Clergy, and the principal householders, and exacted from them a promise of obedience to the royal injunctions. These injunctions gave directions as to the performance of divine service, and were accompanied by a book of Homilies, which, while correcting existing abuses, might prepare for further reforms. At the same time the order was given to procure, for the instruction of the Clergy and for each parish, a copy of the Paraphrase of Erasmus on the New Testament, recently translated into English. All images which had been abused were ordered to be removed.

Gardiner took the lead in opposition to the innovations. He had examined the Homilies and the Paraphrase before they were circulated, and began a controversy with Somerset and Cranmer on the subject, maintaining that the books were contradictory and that they were in opposition to the accepted doctrine of the Church in the "King's Book;" and he further urged that, during the youth of the King, the Church should not be disturbed by innovations. For answer the Bishop was put in prison. Cranmer did his best to induce him to give in; but he refused and went back to the Fleet. Bonner, for the same reasons, was sent to the same place; but he gave in and was set free. It should be mentioned that the Princess Mary also protested against the changes as

disrespectful to the memory of her father and unfair to her young brother.

We have already mentioned the assignment of the property of the Chantries and Colleges to the King; but there were other measures of still greater importance passed into law by the first parliament of Edward VI., such as the order that, in future, the Communion should be administered in both kinds, the abolition of the *Congé d' élire*, and the repeal of the law of the Six Articles.

Along with the order respecting the administration of the Holy Communion, there were penalties imposed upon any who should treat the sacred ordinance with irreverence. In regard to the appointment of bishops, it was no longer to be by the election of the Chapter, but by royal letters patent. It is possible that this change was intended to assert the royal prerogative; but it must be remembered that many regard the *Congé d' élire*, which has been restored, and is the present practice in the Church of England, as something like a farce.

Although the Clergy had submitted to the imperious will of the late King, they were now, by the repeal of several of the penal laws, set free to discuss in their convocations, subjects which were previously forbidden to them. They availed themselves of these liberties by addressing to the Archbishop certain requests—that the committee appointed in the late reign to revise the canons should be revived and their work completed; that the clergy might be represented in Parliament, or else, that no measures relating to the Church should be adopted without

their concurrence; that they should be made acquainted with the work done by the committee appointed for the revision of the services of the Church. They urged that they should have the royal licence that they might take into consideration matters of interest for the Church.

The Archbishop, apparently, was but little inclined to take the same view of the case. The Book of Homilies had been put forth without any consultation with Convocation or Parliament; and notwithstanding the petition of the Clergy that they should be consulted, a proclamation came forth, March 8th, 1548, giving the royal sanction to a new Communion office, which had been drawn up by Cranmer and certain bishops and divines associated with him. The King's proclamation declared that it was established on the "advice of his dear uncle and others of his Privy Council." This manner of procedure would seem somewhat irregular; but it is not fair to represent it as an illustration of the prevalent Erastianism of the period. The office had the sanction of the spiritual head of the English Church, and was then promulgated by royal authority; and many authoritative acts of the Church of Rome have had precisely the same kind of authority, that of the Pope enforced by that of the Emperor or one of the Kings.

With regard to the contents of the office for Holy Communion, the canon stood exactly as it had done in the Sarum Missal, and the whole service was to be used as before; but there was an exhortation provided, which was to be read on the Sunday or Holy

Day, or at least one day, before the celebration of the Sacrament; and the confession and comfortable words were introduced, being derived principally from the "Consultation" of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne. By this office the Cup was restored to the Laity, the Mass was turned into the Communion, and the Service, in part at least, rendered in "a tongue understood of the people."

The book was issued with the proclamation, March 8, and five days later the Bishops had letters sent to them by the council, requiring them to distribute it through their dioceses in time for the Curates to prepare for the administration of the Communion in that manner at the approaching Easter (April 1); also bidding them direct their clergy to use "such good, gentle, and charitable instruction of their simple and unlearned parishioners, that there might be one uniform manner quietly used in all parts of the realm."

It is quite evident that some of the Bishops and a large number of the Clergy were not well affected to the changes; and, instead of obeying the admonition of the Council, they stirred up their people to discontent, so much that a proclamation was issued (April 24) forbidding any to preach who had not a licence from the King, the Lord Protector, or the Archbishop of Canterbury, which was made still more stringent (September 23) by the entire prohibition of preaching, that the "loving subjects" of the King might, in the meantime "occupy themselves to God's honor with due prayer in the Church, and patient hearing of the godly Homilies, and so en-

deavor themselves that they may be the more ready with thankful obedience to receive a most quiet, godly, and uniform order to be had throughout his realms and dominions."

The reformers were between two fires, that of the innovators who would spare nothing which seemed in any way to countenance Roman doctrine or ritual, and that of the reactionaries who thought that things had gone too far already. Consequently it became necessary, on the one hand, to repress those who were given to change, which was done by a proclamation issued in February; and on the other, by a second proclamation in the same month to discourage the reactionaries, giving orders that all images should be removed from the Churches, since the previous command to remove only those which had been abused had caused much contention. The silencing of the licenced preachers is a proof that they were supposed to have abused their opportunities.

Gardiner, who had been set at liberty, was again at the head of the men of the old learning. He seems to have acted, for a time, not only with prudence, but with a fair amount of consistency. Apparently, he was willing to conform silently to the new state of things, but he could not be induced to give his approval. Before long, however, he began to give expression to his dissatisfaction with the proceedings of the Council, and to ally himself with the reactionaries. Accordingly he was required by the Council to preach before the King; and an attempt was made to induce him to preach from

notes furnished to him by Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh, who was then secretary to the Duke of Somerset. This he declined to do. He was told again not to preach about the Sacrament of the Altar, and further that, when he mentioned the authority of the King, he should add, "and the Council." The sermon was delivered June 29, 1548.

The accounts of this sermon do not quite agree; but, as Burnet says he had seen large notes of it, his outline may be accepted as trustworthy. He tells us how Gardiner declared that the Pope's supremacy was justly abolished, and that he approved of the suppression of Monasteries and Chantries. He thought that images might be well used; but they might also be well taken away. He approved of the Sacrament in both kinds, and regarded the taking away of the great number of masses as satisfactory; and he liked the new order for the Communion; but he asserted largely the presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament. "Of the King's authority under age," says Burnet, "and of the power of the Council in that case, he said not a word; and upon that he was imprisoned."

There is little doubt that this was the point in which he gave offence. Some authorities declare that, in this sermon, he protested, as he had done before, against the Council exercising such authority during the minority of the King. But whether this be so, or whether it was that his silence was sufficiently offensive to the Council, it is here that we find the reason for his imprisonment. Many attempts were made to induce him to yield; but in vain, and

he was deprived of his bishopric, and remained in prison until the end of the reign. "These proceedings against him," says Burnet, "were thought too severe and without law; but he being generally hated, they were not so much censured, as they had been, if they had fallen on a more acceptable man."

In the month of July, in the same year, Cranmer put forth his Catechism, or Large Instruction of young persons in the grounds of the Christian religion. In accordance with prevailing Roman and Lutheran usage, he reckoned the first two commandments as one. He remarks that many of the ancients divided them in two; but this was of no importance so long as no part of the decalogue was suppressed. He declares that the pleas employed for the use of images were exactly the same as those offered by the heathen in excuse of their idolatry. They also said they did not worship the image, but only that which was represented by it. Besides the two great Sacraments, he asserts the power of reconciling sinners to God as a third; and declares the divine institution of bishops and priests; he is in favor of the restoration of public penance, and counsels the use of confession by the people to their pastors, that they might bind and loose according to the Gospel. Formerly Cranmer had used language respecting ecclesiastical offices, which seemed to imply that the Sovereign had the power to confer them; but in this work, which was all his own, "he fully sets forth their divine institution." But another and a more important work was now on hand, and one which, from every point of view, has the deepest

significance for all the future history of the Church of England and of the Anglican Communion. This was the compilation of the first Book of Common Prayer.

The question has been debated as to the company by whom the Prayer Book was compiled ; but there seems no good reason for doubting that the work was done by the same commission of bishops and divines, sitting at Windsor, who had drawn up the English additions to the Communion office. This company consisted of the Archbishop, six other bishops, and six doctors, the leading members of whom were Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Goodrich, and Holbeach, representatives of the new learning, Drs. May, Cox, Taylor, and Haynes, advanced reformers, whilst the old learning was represented by Bishops Thirlby, Skip, and May, and others.

In regard to the sources of the Anglican services and the principles on which they were drawn up, more minute and extensive information must be sought in works on Liturgiology.¹ But it is necessary to give here some general account of the work which was now done and of the principles by which the doers of it professed to be guided, and actually were guided. In one word, the principles of liturgical reconstruction were those which underlay the whole movement of the English Reformation. There was no iconoclastic fury, there was no intention of unnecessary change ; but there was a fixed purpose to bring

¹ We may mention Palmer's "*Origines Liturgicæ* ;" Brightman's "*Eastern Liturgies*," "Procter on the Book of Common Prayer," and Freeman's "*Principles of Divine Service*."

back the services to the tone and spirit of the earlier centuries—the centuries of the first four Œcumenical Councils, and to make them more available for general use. Some would have extended the Catholic period to include six councils, or even all those seven which were recognized by the East and West alike; but this makes little practical difference, except in regard to the use of images sanctioned by the seventh, the second Council of Nicæa.

To begin with Matins and Evensong, the two daily services, these were formed from the eight services of the Breviary, in which provision was made for an office to be said every three hours. These services had become restricted to the Clergy and the religious orders; and it was the aim of the reformers to put them into such a shape that they could be used in public, and the people at large could take part in them. To this end three things had to be done. These services, especially the Nocturns, were very long, and as eight of them had to be reduced to two, a considerable amount of condensation was required. Then secondly, all expressions representing doctrines unknown to the earlier ages and at variance with primitive teaching, had to be withdrawn; and finally the English language had to be substituted for the Latin. This was the work undertaken by the Commission at Windsor, which resulted in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. And this book was so excellent that it has remained in substance the Office Book of all branches of the Anglican Communion, and is likely so to remain. These remarks apply not merely to the daily offices,

but also to the great Central Service, or Liturgy proper, of the Holy Eucharist, and all the other services.

These principles are, in substance, set forth in the Preface to the book. The Compilers point out what they believe to have been the design of the "ancient fathers" in drawing up the divine service. In the first place, they intended "that the whole Bible or the greatest part thereof should be read over once in the year." But "this godly and decent order of the ancient fathers," they say, "hath been so altered, broken, and neglected by planting in uncertain stories, legends, responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations and synodals, that commonly when any book of the Bible was begun, before three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread." This evil they remedied by the omission of non-biblical lessons and the new calendar, by which nearly the whole Bible was ordered to be read in the course of a year.

Apart from this, however, they said, the services were of such a character as not to be adapted for popular use. "The service in this Church of England, these many years, hath been read in Latin, to the people, which they understood not; so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind have not been edified thereby." Again, they say, "the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause that to turn the book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be

read than to read it when it was found out." To do away with these difficulties, "such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the scripture" were cut off; and rules set forth "few in number," and also "plain and easy to be understood." Among other advantages, one would be that "by this order the curates shall need none other books for their public service but this Book and the Bible; by the means whereof the people shall not be at so great charge for books, as in time past they have been."

The daily services of Matins and Evensong, as has been said, were taken from the Breviary; Matins, Lauds, and Prime forming the office for Morning Prayer, Vespers and Compline for Evensong.

The principal points in which the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. differs from that which is now in use are: (1) It begins with the Lord's Prayer; (2) It ends with the third Collect; (3) There was no direction to use the Litany, which was put in different places in different editions of the Book; (4) Only the evangelical canticles are given.

The Litany was the same which had been drawn up by Cranmer in 1544, with the omission of the invocation of saints.

The Communion Office was founded upon that of the Sarum Missal, with additions from some of the Oriental Liturgies, and with those parts adapted from Hermann's Consultation which had been taken into the office of 1548. Whilst Antiphons were rejected, the Introits were retained; and these, together with the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, were

generally the same as in the Sarum Missal. Among the features omitted from the English office is, first, the preparation of the Priest before Mass and before beginning the Canon. In the Canon the portion now forming the Prayer for the Church Militant retained its place as before. The sign of the cross in the consecration of the bread and wine was retained; but no breaking of the bread was ordered. There was retained also a thanksgiving for the grace and virtue in the Saints, "and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God;" and then was added an invocation of the Holy Ghost, taken from the Eastern Liturgies. The prayer, which now immediately follows the Lord's Prayer, was here the concluding portion of the Canon. When we add that, at the presentation of the Elements, a little water was added to the wine, we have indicated the principal characteristics of this office. The rubric ordered that, at the Communion, "the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white Alb plain, with a vestment or cope—" a rubric to which reference will have to be made hereafter. At this point it may be well to offer some remarks on the ritual directions in the Communion office. Two extreme theories have been held, on the one hand, that omission is prohibition; on the other hand, that everything which was not explicitly condemned or forbidden was allowed.

Either of these theories could be defended by an advocate who had taken in hand to "defend a thesis."

Neither could satisfy a spirit of loyalty or of common sense. It is absurd to suppose that every movement on the part of the celebrant should be prescribed by the rubric: it is equally absurd to imagine that every ceremony was allowed to be continued, unless it was actually forbidden. Undoubtedly, it was intended that there should be, for a time at least, considerable diversity of usage. There were many who objected to the ceremonial observances of the older ritual; but there were others who would have found it irksome and even difficult to adopt new methods. We may be quite sure that men of the spirit of Cranmer intended, as far as possible, to meet the wishes of both of these classes. Doubtless, it was hoped that, in time, asperities on both sides would be softened, and a middle way might be found in which they could meet. Such a result would, at least, be an illustration of the true spirit of the English Reformation. If it has not been entirely realized, the exceptions and departures are less numerous and less great than they have seemed. How far the blame of these is to be attached to the one side or the other it is not necessary in this place to inquire.

Convocation was sitting at the time when the work was completed and submitted to Parliament; but the records of Convocation are lost, so that we have no direct evidence of the Prayer Book having received their approval. For this reason there are some who maintain that it never came before Convocation; and that this is proved by the fact that several of the bishops afterwards opposed the Act

of Uniformity by which it was enforced. The evidence on the other side, however, is practically irresistible. The message of King Edward to the Devonshire rebels declares that the book was "by the whole clergy agreed." So also the letter from the King and Council to Bonner says that it was accepted "by the bishops and all other learned men in this our realm in their synods and convocations provincial." If it should be said that the Council of the period were capable of misrepresentation, it may be answered that this would have been instantly detected and exposed.

As regards the opposition to the Act of Parliament, it is quite possible that men might approve of the book, and yet not be willing to enforce its use under penalties, or to do so all at once. Having regard to these considerations, it can hardly be necessary to quote authorities on the subject.

The book was authorized by an Act of Parliament which we may call the first Act of Uniformity (2 and 3 Edward VI. C. 1). There can therefore be no doubt that this is the book referred to in the rubric at the beginning of the present Prayer Book, when it speaks of the "second year of the reign of King Edward VI." It was finally read the third time in the House of Lords, January 15, and in the House of Commons, January 21, 1549. The Act required that the book should be used at Whitsuntide, or earlier, if copies could be procured. As a matter of fact it was used in the London Churches at Easter (April 21) and in the country at large, at Pentecost (June 9).

The Act of Uniformity by which the use of the Prayer Book was authorized and enforced gave reasons for its compilation and its form similar to those contained in the Preface to the book. Penalties are proclaimed against all who resist the use of the book or deprave it; for the first offence loss of the profits of one benefice for a year and imprisonment for six months; for a second offence loss of all benefices and imprisonment for a year; and for a third offence imprisonment for life.

The same Parliament passed an "Act to take away all positive laws made against the marriage of priests." (2 and 3 Edward VI. C. 21). The right of marriage among the clergy had been unanimously asserted by the Convocation at the beginning of the reign of King Edward; but the anti-reforming bishops had opposed the bill introduced to legalize the proposal. The Parliament now declared that it was better for the clergy to remain in the single state, but that all obligation to do so was now removed.

The observance of Lent was enforced by the same Parliament (2 and 3 Edward VI. C. 19). The eating of flesh was forbidden on Fridays and Saturdays in Lent, on Ember days, and generally on all fast days, the reason given being not religious expediency or ecclesiastical custom, but the beneficial effect of fasting on the bodily health, and the interests of the fishermen.

It was soon discovered that the new Prayer Book was not to find universal acceptance; and the opposition to its use was strengthened by the bishops and

clergy of the old learning. Many of them managed to make the services inaudible, and in other ways so similar to those which had made place for them that, to the congregation, they seemed the same. Some also used in the Communion Services many of the old ceremonies, "such as crossing the altar, crossing themselves, lifting the book from one place to another, breathing on the bread, showing it openly before the distribution,"¹ and so forth.

As a consequence a second visitation took place in the Autumn of 1549, which was intended to give effect to the Act of Uniformity, and to stop those irregular practices, as is apparent from the contents of the articles. Some of the practices mentioned were forbidden, such as kissing the altar, shifting the book, breathing upon the bread or chalice, and the like. It was also ordered that not more than one Communion should be held in one day in any Church or Chapel. Orders were also sent by the Council to the Bishop of London, Bonner, to see that there should be no special masses in St. Paul's Cathedral, since that, being the Mother Church in the principal city of the Kingdom, would be regarded as an example to all the rest. Bonner sent the letter to the Dean and Canons residentiary; and there and elsewhere obedience seems to have been so complete that the visitors made no complaint.

About this time there arose a controversy, which was destined to last for centuries in the Anglican Communion, respecting the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. There was no doctrine for which

¹ Burnet.

one school contended so strenuously, or which was so vigorously attacked by another school, as the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Since the Lateran Council of A. D. 1216 this had been the accepted doctrine of the Western Church, the Greek Church holding a theory so nearly allied to this that it is to this day disputed whether they are not identical. The Lutheran doctrine, called by others, but not by the authoritative documents of that Church, Consubstantiation, asserted the presence of the Body of Christ, but denied the removal of the substance of bread and wine, which the Romans affirmed. The Swiss divines went further, Calvin holding a kind of real presence, of which believing communicants were made participants by entering by faith into the holiest of all; and Zwingli holding that the Sacrament was merely a commemoration of the death of Christ.

Two eminent foreigners, recently arrived in England, took a prominent part in these controversies. One was Martin Bucer, an Alsatian, a contemporary and fellow-worker with Luther. He was a man of extensive learning and of great moderation, who had attempted to mediate between Luther and Zwingli. He was born in 1491; and was brought over to Cambridge, by Cranmer, to be Professor of Divinity, in 1549. He died at Cambridge, February 27, 1551. The other was Peter Martyr, an Italian, born 1500, and dying at Zurich in 1562. Adopting the principles of the Swiss Reformation, while still Prior at Lucca, he fled from Italy, and in 1547 came to England, and was appointed lecturer in the Holy Scrip-

tures at Oxford. On the accession of Mary he returned to the Continent.

Burnet says that the Roman party at Oxford were much encouraged by the indulgence of the government and the gentleness of Cranmer's temper, so that on this head they became "insolent out of measure." Controversies also broke out at Cambridge on the subject of Transubstantiation. A chief interest in these controversies for ourselves is found in the fact that Ridley and Cranmer had been led by the reading of the treatise of Bertram (Ratramnus) to discover that in the ninth century the theory of Radbert had been called in question. It might be hazardous to say that this book exactly represents the permanent opinions of Cranmer; but it is probable that he would have accepted its contents for the most part.¹

One of the unhappy incidents of this time was the persecution of the Anabaptists, many of whom, escaping from persecutions in Germany, had sought refuge in England. They rejected all doctrines not found in the Bible, also Infant Baptism. But a more extreme faction among them went much further, denying nearly all Christian doctrine, and setting themselves up as the fifth monarchy. Several of them who had disseminated their opinions, recanted and were let off with light punishments. But one of them, Joan Bocher, called Joan of Kent, asserted the Mennonite doctrine, that Christ was not truly incarnate. She was found guilty of blasphemy

¹ Burnet gives a summary of Bertram's argument; and Dr. Pusey takes the book as representing the views of Ridley and Cranmer.

and sentenced to be burned. The young King was most reluctant to sign the warrant; but Cranmer persuaded him, yet without wholly convincing him; for he set his hand to the warrant with tears in his eyes, telling Cranmer that, if he did wrong, it was in submission to his authority, and he should answer for it to God. The Archbishop was so moved by this that he sought to prevent the execution; and he and Ridley endeavored to get the woman to recant, a suggestion which she received with so much insolence that they had to desist, and so she was burned (May, 1549). The Romans were not slow to justify themselves by the practice of their opponents.

Tumults broke out in various parts of England and grew considerable in Devonshire, as being distant from the court, and "generally inclined to the former superstition, and many of the old priests were in among them." Among the demands formulated by the rebels there were such as these, that all the general Councils should be observed, that the Six Articles should be revived, that the Mass should be in Latin, that the Sacrament should be elevated and worshipped. Cranmer was instructed by the Council to answer the articles, which he did, pointing out that their demands were insolent, dictated by seditious priests; that they knew nothing of the decrees of general Councils none of which were contravened by the Church of England; the elevation and adoration of the Sacrament was a recent innovation, and so forth. Finally they were defeated and dispersed here and elsewhere; and a general pardon was proclaimed, some of the ringleaders being punished as a warning.

Soon after this Bonner was in trouble again. We have seen that he complied with the command of the Council that he should enforce the use of the new Service book. But he was known to favor the malcontents; so he was required to preach at Paul's Cross in approval of the new settlement, condemning rebellion, and declaring the authority of the King as not being affected by his minority. By way of response he preached to a great assembly (Sept. 1), dwelling principally on the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament and saying nothing on the Supremacy. Accordingly he was deprived, and sent to the Tower.

The fall of Somerset, the Protector, took place in the autumn of 1549; but this requires us to go back to an earlier part of the same year, to mention the case of the admiral, his younger brother. Sir Thomas Seymour, afterward Lord Sudeley, had been attached to Catharine Parr; but the King's command could not be resisted, and she became the sixth wife of Henry VIII. Not long after his death she married Seymour and died in childbirth in the following year (1548). Soon after the death of Catharine, he began to pay his addresses to the Princess Elizabeth. As it had been declared treason to marry the King's sisters without consent of Council, he began to make preparations to carry off the King and resist the authority of the council. The Protector, his brother, warned him in vain; and on January 19, 1549, he was sent to the tower. Refusing to make submission, he was attainted, found guilty of treason and executed, March 20.

Somerset's own turn was soon to come. Dudley, Earl of Warwick, son of one of the instruments of the rapacity of Henry VII., was rising in importance; and Somerset had lost favor partly through his greed and ambition, partly through his misgovernment. He was accused of violating the condition on which he was made Protector, that he should do nothing without the consent of the other guardians, of having debased the coin, having encouraged the late insurrections, having exercised undue constraint on the King, and so forth. He was sent to the Tower where he endured his sufferings with patience and dignity. He was afterwards released for a season, but was again arrested, and was beheaded Jan. 22, 1552. The fall of Somerset and the rise of Warwick to power caused alarm among the Protestants and exultation among the Roman party, but their expectations were not realized.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE FIRST ENGLISH ORDINAL.



THE first Prayer Book had come out in the month of March, 1549, with the title "The Book of the Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England." Besides a Preface and a calendar it contained the "order for Matins and Evensong;" next, the Introits, Collects, Epistles and Gospels, with proper Psalms and Lessons for diverse feasts and days; then the service for "the Supper of the Lord and Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass;" after that services for Baptism, both public and private; for Confirmation, preceded by a Catechism, substantially the same as the present catechism, down to the end of the answer on the Lord's Prayer. Then a Marriage Service, scarcely altered since then; a service "of Visitation of the sick, and communion of the same;" of Burial; the "Purification of Women;" service for Ash Wednesday, the same as at present. After this came a section "of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained;" and "certain notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in this book." Only one of these notes need here be referred to, and this as confirming the view already given in regard to the omission of rubri-

cal directions, some of which have been restored. "As touching, kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures: they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame."

There was no service contained in this book for ordinations and consecrations; but it was from the first intended to be added; and it was drawn up by the same commission, and was published February 2, 1550. This service remains substantially the same, the delivery of the paten and chalice being omitted in 1552, and certain additions made in 1662.

Much controversy has arisen in regard to the significance of this ordinal, its origin, intention, and contents. The reformers have been blamed for not following more closely the ancient models and for having allowed Martin Bucer to destroy the Catholic character of the service. A few words, in the simple interest of historical truth, may be devoted to this subject.

In regard to the connection between the new ordinal and the older Latin services, the reformers took precisely the same course which they had adopted in drawing up the other services. Instead of being chargeable with neglecting the ancient methods and forms, they took the greatest pains to retain all that belonged to Christian antiquity, and removed only those parts which were of comparatively modern origin, and which they regarded as unnecessary or superstitious.

In regard to the existing Roman or Sarum Pontifi-

cal, as has been pointed out,¹ it would have been extremely difficult and inconvenient to have merely translated this document, even with the necessary changes and omissions. It had not the charm of antiquity. It had been put together at different times, and in such a manner as to make its parts incoherent and inconsistent. For example, according to primitive usage, the first part of the present service for the ordination of priests, including the silent laying on of hands and the Prayer, *Vere dignum*, was sufficient to make a priest. But this is not recognized in the rubrics which call the candidates *ordinandi* down to the point at which the delivery of the paten and chalice (*porrectio instrumentorum*) takes place. But this is not all. If there is one passage in the New Testament which may be regarded as most significant of the commission given by our Lord to His ministers it is that contained in St. John XX. 22, 23. But this passage does not occur in the Latin Service until long after the ordinand has been recognized as a priest. The reformers evidently had no mind to sink the sacerdotal character of the clergy, as they have often been charged with doing; but whatever their mind on this subject may have been, they chose the only words of the Lord Jesus which they could find, conferring the full extent of the ministerial commission. They stood in the first ordinal, as they do now, the words in brackets having been added in 1662: "Receive the Holy Ghost [for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our

¹ Church Quarterly Review, April 1897.

hands]. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." In regard to the portions added, here and in the consecration of bishops, there was no intention of supplying any defect which was supposed to exist in regard to the designation of the orders: the additions were rather pointed against the Puritans.

Taking a simple historical view of what took place in the composition of this ordinal it is difficult to understand the attacks which Roman controversialists have made upon it. One of them has gone so far as to say that Cranmer "sent for Bucer, a Lutheran, to come over to England and draw up a rite for making Gospel Ministers, such as he had drawn up for the German Lutherans, which was practically accepted." As simple matter-of-fact, nearly every proposition here is a misstatement. Bucer was brought over by Cranmer, to escape the persecution of the Lutherans and Reformed, which had broken out on the Continent. He was appointed professor at Cambridge, but there is no reason to think that he had any special influence in the drawing up of the English formularies. As regards the ordinal, we are in possession of a Latin form of Bucer's which may have been intended as a model for the English Service, but which differs so widely from it as to show that the English reformers in no way intended to be guided by Bucer. It was not

practically accepted ; and as regards the making of Gospel ministers, we should be much surprised if any Puritan should select the particular form for the ordination of priests adopted in the English ordinal, although he might submit to the use of it, after it had been chosen.

Perhaps we should notice one argument employed against the validity of the English ordinal, if it were only for its *naïveté*. It has been contended that the Act is vitiated by the omission of the *porrectio instrumentorum*. In the first ordinal, it was said, "The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them, the Bible in the one hand, and the chalice or cup with the bread, in the other hand"; but without the words used in the Latin ordinal: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass for the living and the dead." In the second ordinal of 1552 there was no delivery of vessels at all. In the judgment of the reformers the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist had been made too prominent: moreover this was not the only Sacrament which priests were to celebrate. To the accusation that the ordination is thus rendered invalid the Anglican replies, it is impossible that the omission of the delivery of the vessels or of the accompanying words should render the ordination invalid, seeing that no such ceremony was known in the Roman Church for at least nine hundred years. What is the answer to this? The answer involves such a complete begging of the question that it demands some degree of consideration to which it is essentially not entitled. The answer is this: That a local or national Church has no right

to omit ceremonies even of modern introduction, which have been sanctioned by the universal Church. We do not reply to this merely, that these ceremonies are not universal, that they are unknown in various branches of the Eastern Church; but further, that this objection strikes at the very principle of the English Reformation. If that cannot be defended, it would be mere trifling to discuss its application to such a detail as that which we are now considering.

The principle of the English Reformation was not a claim to return to the mere letter of the Scriptures; but to the institutions of the first ages of the Church and to the Word of God as interpreted by the early Fathers. As we understand this principle, it was not intended to stereotype the teaching of the Church at a particular moment, in such a sense that no subsequent development of that doctrine should be permitted. But it was intended to reject all later mediæval accretions which were inconsistent with primitive teaching, and of which no germ could be found in the first days of the Church. It was on this ground that Anglicans rejected the Supremacy, not the Primacy, of the Bishop of Rome, Invocation of Saints, and the comparatively modern doctrine of Transubstantiation. If this position can be theologically overthrown, it is for the adherents of the Church of Rome to do so: it is quite absurd, in a controversy over a reformed service, to assume the Roman position as a major premise in the argument.

The intention of the compilers of the first English ordinal is perfectly clear. They believed that the three orders were of apostolic origin: in the Preface

to the ordinal they say: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." They intended, therefore, by means of these services, to make Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and they intended that they should be made in the primitive manner, "by public prayer with imposition of hands." In these services they ordered all to be done which had been done in the early liturgies of the Church, removing from the later offices only such parts as were inconsistent, redundant or superstitious. As regards the designation to the particular office, in the ordering of Priests, the order is named in the exhortation to the people, and the words accompanying the laying on of hands could apply only to the Priesthood. In the Consecration of a Bishop, not only is the ordinand presented as one who is "to be Consecrated Bishop," but he also takes the oath to the Archbishop as one "chosen Bishop of the Church;" and, after the Consecration, the pastoral staff is, by the Archbishop, put into his hands.

Of the twelve who took part in the drawing up of the ordinal only one, Heath, Bishop of Worcester, refused his consent to the office; nor could the Council persuade him to accept it. He was therefore committed to the Fleet because "he obstinately denied to subscribe the book for the making of Bishops and Priests." Says Burnet: "He had hitherto opposed everything done toward reformation in Parliament, though he had given an entire

obedience to it when it was enacted. He was a man of a gentle temper and great prudence, that understood affairs of state better than matters of religion. But now it was resolved to rid the Church of those compilers who submitted out of fear or interest to save their benefices; but were still ready, upon any favorable conjuncture, to return back to the old superstition." Gardiner, then in prison, was not quite satisfied with the ordinal and disliked the omission of the Uction; yet he was willing to accept and enforce it, so that he must have regarded it as, at least, sufficient.

CHAPTER XIV.

FOREIGN INFLUENCES AND THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK.



It soon became apparent that many were not satisfied with the changes which had been made in the churches and the services, and that an attempt would be made to conform the Church of England more nearly to the model of continental Protestantism. It would hardly be exact to say that hitherto the Reformation had been a purely English work without any influence being exerted from without; but a time had come when those influences were to be felt more powerfully, and when there were men in office who sympathized more deeply with them.

On the one hand there was a feeling in England that the Protestant nations and churches should draw more closely together for mutual defence, especially as Roman divines were uniting at the Council of Trent, and it was probable that attempts would be made to enforce the decrees of the Council. On the other hand, several of the bishops of the old learning had been dispossessed, and their places taken by men who were prepared to advance further in the path of reform. Ridley, Bishop of Rochester, succeeded Bonner as Bishop of London (April, 1550); Poynt took the place of Gardiner at Winchester (February, 1551). But before this the Earl of War-

wick, now supreme, had recommended Hooper for the see of Gloucester, as being of opinions congenial to those of the King (July 3, 1550).

Hooper was a thoroughgoing Protestant, objecting to the remains of mediævalism which he considered still to cleave to the reformed services of the Church of England. He had been a Cistercian monk in England until the dissolution of the religious houses on the passing of the Six Articles. He had gone to the continent and in 1547 to Zurich, where he lived for two years with Bullinger. In May, 1549, he had returned to England, being made chaplain first to the Duke of Somerset, and then to King Edward. He found fault with various features in the Prayer Book, which he said was "to be borne with for the weak's sake awhile." But on one point he was obstinate. When he was nominated to Gloucester, he refused to wear the Episcopal vestments which he called the "Aaronic habits." Efforts were made to induce Cranmer to dispense with them; but the Archbishop refused to break the law. Bucer and Peter Martyr tried to convince Hooper that the mere wearing of a garment was no infringement of Gospel principles, but in vain. Ridley did his best with the same result. Finally he was committed to the charge of Cranmer; but the Archbishop had to report his want of success. The Council then applied their last argument by sending him to the Fleet, January 27, 1551. At last he gave way (March 8) and was consecrated. Hooper, at his consecration, also took the oath of supremacy to which he had previously objected on grounds which are not quite clear.

Among the sometimes questionable proceedings of this period there are few which seem to churchmen of the present day so offensive as the wholesale destruction of altars. Prominent among the iconoclasts was Ridley, who had been chaplain to Cranmer, was made Bishop of Rochester, and soon afterward succeeded to London. While still at Rochester, he had begun the work; and, when he went to London, Hooper expressed his hope that he would destroy the "altars of Baal" in his new diocese. When we consider how much has been done, in recent years, with general consent, to replace the altars and the furniture of the sanctuary in all parts of the Anglican Communion, the proceedings of Ridley and his fellow-workers must seem wanton and unreasonable. But, in fact, it is hardly possible for anyone, in these times, to understand the feelings of the reformers on these subjects, or the justification which they might plead for them. It is impossible for us to deny that the meaning of the Holy Eucharist had been greatly perverted. From a sacred feast with a sacrificial character, like the peace offering, it had been turned into a sacrifice, generally without participation on the part of the congregation; and the offering of private masses had become a mechanical business and a kind of trade, which the largest charity could hardly regard as edifying or even as tolerable. Men like Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer were bent upon putting an end to this state of things, as a consequence of which the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is but just recognized in the English communion service. When, however,

they found that the new Prayer Book had not produced the desired effect, and that many of the clergy kept alive as much of the older ritual as they could connect with the new service, and "counterfeited the popish Mass," it was no great wonder that more drastic measures should be taken.

Some progress had been made in the work of demolition, but it was partial and incomplete. Some priests were using the old altars, some the tables which had been set up in their places. Ridley, in his desire for "godly unity," gave orders for the removal of the altar, the reredos, the super-altar and the like, and required "the Lord's Board, after the form of an honest table, decently covered" to be set up. The same order was adopted and sent out by the Council to all the bishops (November, 1550). This had already been done in St. Paul's Cathedral on St. Barnabas day of this year, under Ridley's superintendence—"the wall standing then by the high altar's side" being broken down. At the same time the tables began to be placed in what was regarded as the most convenient position, a preparation for the change to be made by the next Prayer Book. Bishop Day of Chichester refused obedience and was sent to prison, December 10, 1550; and Tunstall, now of Durham, followed him, December 20, 1551.

Two things now began to engage the attention of the English Reformers—the drawing up of a series of "Articles of Religion," and the revision of the Prayer Book. In the latter work Cranmer had the assistance of the foreign divines who had taken refuge in

England, chief among whom were Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, already mentioned. Bucer was a man of great moderation, and he died (February 28, 1551) before the second Prayer Book was published. What influence he had upon its composition we do not know, and it has been said that he did not altogether approve of the proposed changes; but his *Censura*, published less than two months before his death, showed that he was in general sympathy with the innovations.

This "Censure" of Bucer took the form of a criticism of the first book, and extended to twenty-eight chapters. He disapproves of the use of the choir for divine service, as involving a separation of the Clergy from the Laity. Of the Communion Service he approves, but wishes the bread to be made thicker and more like ordinary bread. He objects to the rubric which left certain gestures indifferent, and to the presence of non-communicants. He objects to the vestments as having been abused, and to the practice of putting the bread into the mouth of the communicant. He also objects to prayers for the dead, to the mention of the angels, and several other points in the first Prayer Book. He disapproves of the practice of having a second celebration, although he admits that it had been an ancient custom on great festivals. He does not think there should be more communicants at Easter and Christmas than at other times: all should communicate every Sunday. His remarks on the other services are in the same direction, but of less importance.

Peter Martyr had been in England before the

drawing up of the first book; but it does not appear that he had any hand in its composition. He took part, however, in the criticism of the book, while it was under revision; but, being ignorant of English, he had to do so by means of a Latin translation. When he read Bucer's criticism, he signified his agreement with it, and expressed his surprise that Bucer had not condemned the practice of carrying the consecrated elements out of the Church to sick persons who might be unable to attend.

Another influential foreigner was John Laski, or à Lasco, a Polish nobleman, in bishop's orders, who had taken refuge in England in 1550, and had become Superintendent of the Congregations of foreign Protestants in London. He was said by a Protestant, writing to Bullinger, to have roused the Archbishop "from his dangerous lethargy" into which he had fallen some time before. However this may have been, there grew up in England a strong desire for a revision of the Prayer Book of 1549.

Among those who urged on the work was the young King himself, now fourteen years of age, who declared that if the Clergy would not remove the objectionable passages, he would pass over Convocation and bring the matter before Parliament. The revisors of the Prayer Book are therefore not entirely responsible for all that was done, except for their compliance with the will of the boy King which in those days it was not quite safe to resist. At the same time, there is no reason to suspect that Cranmer was opposed either to the particular changes which were now made or to the tendencies which

they indicated. It is not quite accurate to say that Cranmer took his theological views from the circumstances in which he found himself. In the early days of the Reformation he had held the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, and had joined in punishing those who had rejected it. But he had certainly advanced to the Lutheran position in the reign of Henry VIII., when there was some danger in holding such views.

And now he seems to have entered upon a new phase of opinion, closely resembling that of the Swiss reformers; to which he was influenced partly by the foreign divines, partly by Ridley, and partly by his antagonism to the party who were trying to nullify the reforming work of the first Prayer Book. The result of this process is seen in his treatise, published in 1550, entitled the "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ." Without entering upon the discussion of a subject which has furnished controversy for centuries, we may point out the importance of this treatise in relation to the English Reformation.

In the first place, then, Cranmer insisted upon the grace of the Sacrament, regarding the elements as the instruments by which this grace was conveyed to the worthy receiver. In this respect he differed both from those who regarded the ordinance as a mere commemoration, and from those who considered it to be a merely external means for the stirring up of faith and gratitude. On the negative side, he proceeded to condemn four errors of Romans and Luth-

erans: Transubstantiation, the Corporal presence, the eating and drinking of Christ by the wicked, and the expiatory sacrifice of the Mass. Each of these topics is considered in a separate book.

Gardiner was in prison, still nominally and legally Bishop of Winchester, and about this time was called upon to give his opinion on the new Prayer Book and ordinal. In answering this demand, he managed to introduce his answer to Cranmer's treatise, and got his tract printed in France, January, 1551. It must be admitted that Cranmer treated his adversary with perfect fairness, since he reprinted his own original treatise and Gardiner's answer word for word; and then added his own rejoinder. He contemplated a more complete work, but this was interrupted by the death of King Edward.

The proposed revision of the Prayer Book was brought before Convocation by Cranmer in 1550; but nothing seems to have been decided upon; and we can only conjecture that the work, when it was completed, was sanctioned by Convocation. It was finally authorized by the second Act of Uniformity, (5 and 6 Edward VI. C. 1), January, 1552; and it may be as well to pay some attention to this Act before noting the changes made in the book, since its contents are of some importance in regard to those changes and the liberty of opinion in matters of doctrine allowed to ministers of the English Church.

It is possible for us, at this time of day, to consider these subjects with perfect calmness and freedom from prejudice, inasmuch as the Prayer Book now in use differs considerably from the second

Prayer Book, and particularly in those points with regard to which controversy has chiefly arisen. So much being premised we have no hesitation in saying, first, that it was intended, under the second book, to tolerate all the opinions, if not all the practices sanctioned by the first book; but also, that it was intended to discountenance some of them. The first of these appears from the Act of Uniformity, the second from the contents of the services.

This second Act of Uniformity declared that the first book contained nothing but "what was agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church;" and that such doubts as had arisen in connection with its contents and requirements had arisen rather from "curiosity and misunderstanding than of any other worthy cause." In order to do away with these difficulties, certain alterations had been made, and the book thus altered was henceforth to be used. It is possible that, when the Act was drawn up, the amount of the changes made was imperfectly known, as the book was not published until nine months afterwards. However this may be, the clergy were required to use it and the Laity were required under penalties to be present at the public services. Moreover the requirement of the clerical use of the book was made more distinct and explicit.

In the Preface to the first book, in regard to Matins and Evensong it had been said: "Neither that any man shall be bound to the saying of them, but such as, from time to time, in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, Parish Churches, and Chapels to the same annexed, shall serve the Congregation."

In the second book, the Preface is made to read, nearly as it now stands, as follows, the italics showing the portions in the Preface to the second edition now altered or omitted, the portions in brackets being such as we now have them. "And all priests and deacons *shall be bound* [are] to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, *except they be letted by preaching, studying of divinity* [not being let by sickness] or by some other urgent cause." "And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably *letted* [hindered], shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall *toll a bell there to* [cause a bell to be tolled thereunto], a convenient time before he begin, that *such as be disposed* [the people] may come to hear God's word and to pray with him."

Here it is quite clear that the same general purpose which had animated the compliers of the first book was present at the drawing up of the second. Their design was that people should attend and take part in the ordinary services of the Church, and that instead of the mere assisting at masses, which often did not mean hearing and joining in those services, the people should hear the Word of God read, should receive instruction in Divine truth, and should take an intelligent part in the prayers offered in the public services. We can see also, that, in this second book, the hortatory element was made more prominent.

The changes made in Morning and Evening Prayer were of no special significance, except in the

direction mentioned, and perhaps in the tendency to minimize the distance between Clergy and Laity. The first Prayer Book had begun: "The Priest being in the Choir shall begin with a loud voice the Lord's Prayer, called the *Pater Noster*." Even here there is a departure from the Latin use, in which the Lord's Prayer had been said silently down to the phrase, *sed libera nos a malo* (but deliver us from evil), which was spoken aloud. But the changes in the second book were more serious. It is the "Minister" and not the "Priest" who is to say the service, and not necessarily in the Choir, but "in such place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel, and the minister shall so turn him as the people may best hear." However this is added, "and the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past."

The first book had begun with the Lord's Prayer. To the Morning Service, but not yet to Evensong, in the second book there were prefixed the sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution, almost identical with those now used, except that the spelling is modernized and some slight archaisms have been altered. The next change is the addition of the *Jubilate*, as an alternative for the *Benedictus*. Then two or three slight changes are made in the saying of the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Versicles. At Evening Prayer the *Cantate* is introduced as an alternative to the *Magnificat*, and the *Deus misereatur* to the *Nunc Dimittis*. The Litany is placed after the Athanasian Creed.

In regard to the Litany, we may remark that we still find in this book the suffrage for which we are

indebted to the period of Henry VIII. : "From all sedition and privy conspiracy, *from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities*, from all false doctrine," etc. Before leaving this part of the subject it may be proper to remark that the exhortations introduced here and elsewhere, which to us may seem tedious, wearisome, and unnecessary, were probably of the highest utility when first introduced, having regard to the general ignorance of the people and the inability of most of them to read.

Most of the services were altered on the same principles. Thus, in the service for public baptism, apart from sundry rearrangements of the parts, the exorcism contained in the earlier service ("I command thee, unclean spirit, in the Name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these infants, etc.") is omitted. So the manner of baptism is changed. In the first book the priest was directed to name the child and "dip it in the water thrice: first dipping the right side; second the left side; the third time dipping the face toward the front." In the second book he was merely to "dip it in the water." In both books it is to be "discreetly and warily done;" and "if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." In the first book after the baptism it is ordered: "Then the godfathers and godmothers shall take and lay their hands upon the child, and the minister shall put upon him his white vesture, commonly called the chrisom; and say; 'Take this white vesture for a token of the innocence, etc.' All this is omitted in the second book. The

priest was further directed to "anoint the infant upon the head." This was also omitted. But the signing with the cross which, in the first book, had occurred at an earlier place, was now introduced here. One remarkable addition to the second book is the prayer of thanksgiving "that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit;" showing clearly that the Puritans of that period had not introduced the confusion, so common soon afterward, between regeneration and conversion.

In the Confirmation Service the Catechism still stood as the introduction. The principal difference in the service was the omission of the crossing by the Bishop of the forehead of the candidate, before the laying on of hands, which was ordered in the first book.

In the Form of the Solemnization of Matrimony at the giving of the ring, the words ran thus in the first book: "With this ring I thee wed; [This gold and silver I thee give]; with my body I thee worship; and with all my worldly goods I thee endow." The clause in brackets was omitted in the second book, together with the rubrical direction (after the word "ring"): "and other tokens of spousage, as gold or silver." Several slight changes are made in the prayers. For example, in the Collect beginning, "O God of Abraham," after the words "bless them," there stood: "As thou diddest send thy Angel Raphael to Tobie and Sara, the daughter of Raguel to their great comfort." This disappears in the second book. One point of some interest may be noted.

In the first book it was ordered, after the marriage and the first blessing, "Then shall they go into the Choir," clearly meaning the married couple. In the second book, it stands: "Then the ministers or clerks, going to the Lord's table," leaving the position of the married couple undetermined.

In regard to the visitation of the sick, it may seem surprising that so little change was made, almost the only difference between the services being the omission of this rubric: "If the sick person desire to be anointed, then shall the priest anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross." In regard, however, to the strong statement of absolution, it must be remembered that the early Puritans held very decided opinions as to the ministerial power of the Keys, and binding and loosing.

In the order of the Burial of the Dead, there is a good deal changed in the arrangement of the service, and the "Celebration of the Holy Communion, with its Collect (embodied however in the new service), Epistle, and Gospel, is omitted in the second book; but the only change of much significance is the omission, from the prayer of thanksgiving, of the petition: "Grant, we beseech Thee, that at the day of judgment, his soul and all the souls of Thy elect, departed out of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive Thy promises, and be made perfect together, through the glorious resurrection of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."

It was, however, in the Communion Service, as we might expect, that the most serious changes were

made. And here it is necessary to be very watchful over our judgments since it is not merely our doctrinal predilections, but our liturgical sense, which must be gratified or offended. As before, we restrict ourselves to the notice of those changes which seem to have a doctrinal meaning. On one point there may perhaps be some doubt. Whether we are to regard the breaking of the "Canon of the Mass" into three parts—the Prayer for the Church Militant, the Prayer of Consecration, and the first of the two Collects after the second Lord's Prayer—as an attempt to lessen the importance of the celebration may be doubted. On the one hand, it may have been intended to give the congregation a firmer hold on the meaning of the different parts of the service; on the other hand, the compilers may have desired that those who departed without receiving the Sacrament might yet join in some of the prayers. The reason for the dislocation of the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable words, and putting these parts of the service before the Prefaces, instead of after the Consecration, is not apparent. On other points, however, the reason of the changes is tolerably plain.

Premising that we have here hardly any concern with the origin of our services or their relation to the ancient Liturgies of the Church, but simply with their contents as illustrating the progress of the English Reformation, we proceed to note the changes in the Communion Service.

To begin with the Heading of the Service. In the first book it was: "The Supper of the Lord and the

Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." In the second it was: "The order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion." But for its connection with other changes, the omission of the word "Mass" need have meant little. The word itself is of doubtful origin; but it had got so thoroughly associated with the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist that the reformers resolved to remove it.

It is probable that the alterations in the initiatory rubrics were determined by the same considerations. For some time there had been troubles, as in the case of Hooper, about the vestments. The providing of a special garment for the Service of the Altar invested that service with a peculiar dignity; and although the chasuble itself was simply an adaptation of an out-of-door garment worn in Rome, yet it had come to be considered as the vestment proper for the offerer of the sacrifice; and for these reasons it had been objected to. Hence the change in the second book. In the earlier one it had been ordered that "the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry [of the Communion] shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say: a white alb plain with a vestment or cope." And it was further ordered that the assistants should wear "albs with tunicles." All this disappears in the second book, and a rubric is inserted at the beginning of Morning Prayer, ordering "that the minister at the time of the Communion and all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but, being Archbishop or

Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only." The obvious reason for its appearing at the beginning of the book was that the garment was to be the same at all the services.

There is also a change in the position of the Holy Table. Up to this time it had stood against the eastern wall of the Church, generally with a reredos behind it. For reasons already mentioned, altars and their adjuncts had been broken down; and now it is ordered that the table at Communion time having "a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the Church, or in the Chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said." Here the same disposition is manifested to reduce the Holy Communion to the level of the other services. It is not said, in so many words, that the table shall stand East and West, but this is implied in the instructions to the minister.

In the first book the order was: "The Priest standing before the 'Middes' of the Altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer, etc." Under the influences already noted the word "altar" disappears from the English Service book, and does not return, although it occurs in the Coronation Service; and the table with a fair white linen cloth takes its place. The direction now runs: "And the Priest, standing at the North Side of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, etc." All that need be said on this subject at present is, that the Priest was ordered to stand at precisely the same part of the table as he had done when it stood North and South against the eastern

wall. He stood at the side which had been the West, and was now the North Side of the table. The bearing of this rubric will be seen on controversies long after this period.

The next change we note is the introduction of the Ten Commandments, followed by a prayer for mercy and grace, in the place hitherto occupied by the Lesser Litany. This is one of the features of the revised service which has been objected to and it does seem rather an odd place for the Commandments to occupy. Yet the principle had not been entirely without recognition in the Latin services; and apparently we must seek the explanation in the resolutions of the reformers that these services should be intelligent offerings, and not mere saying of prayers by rote. We can see this thought everywhere, and the intention must be commended as praiseworthy.

We should remark that the Introit, appointed to be said after the Prayer for Purity and before the Lesser Litany was now struck out, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which came between the Lesser Litany and the Collect for the day, was removed to the end of the service.

Passing over changes of a slighter character, and transpositions, some of which have been noted, we come to the Canon or Prayer of Consecration, divided, in the second book, into three parts, already mentioned, whilst some portions disappear. The principal changes are the following: In the first book it was ordered to put "a little pure and clean water" to the wine. In the second this is omitted.

The crossings and manual acts are also omitted in the second book ; also the reference to "the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary," and to the "holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs." The invocation of the Holy Spirit is also omitted. It ran thus: "With Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ." The following words, coming between the Consecration and that portion of the Canon which now forms the Prayer after the second Lord's Prayer, were also omitted: "Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before Thy divine majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, etc." The motive was still the desire to throw the sacrificial idea into the background, and probably also to disparage the doctrine of the Real Presence.

In reference to the vestments, it should perhaps be added that the alternative offered in the first Prayer Book of vestment or cope was not sanctioned by pre-reformation usage, the cope not being regarded as a Eucharistic garment. This point should be kept in mind in reference to subsequent orders.

There was also a change in regard to the elements, not only in the omission of the mixture of water with the wine already noted, but in the instructions

with regard to the bread to be used. In the first book it was ordered that it should be made "through all this realm, after one sort and fashion, that is to say, unleavened and round, as it was before, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces: and every one shall be divided in two pieces at the least, or more, by the discretion of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ." In the second book, there is a great change. The words of the rubric run thus: "And to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." Before passing away from the subject of the elements, it may be noted that, whereas the first of the two sentences now employed in administering the paten or chalice was ordered under the first book, the second was substituted under the second book, thus removing the reference to the Body and Blood of Christ.

So far the changes had been considerable; but perhaps the most serious departure from the earlier type is found in the "Black Rubric," introduced by the Council, against the wishes of Cranmer, only a few days before the publication of the book. This rubric was removed at the Elizabethan revision, and it was put back with considerable modifications at

the Restoration of Charles II. Its significance at this time is unquestionable. After setting forth that the kneeling at the reception of the Sacrament is to show the communicant's "humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ," the rubric goes on: "Lest the same meaning might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine then bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence then being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be in more places than in one at one time."

In regard to the toleration of the ceremonies in use under the Latin services, we have seen that considerable liberty was allowed, in this respect, under the first book; and that it was only when a certain number among the Clergy showed a determination to retain the whole mediæval system, as far as that was possible, that more strenuous measures began to be taken. But there was a considerable change under the second book. Not only was the rubric for the manual acts withdrawn, but the "Certain notes" of the first book, one of which allowed "touching, kneeling, crossing," etc., "as every man's devotion serveth." The first book was an expression of the

desire of the reformers to retain, as far as possible, the men of the old learning; and Gardiner declared himself satisfied with it. In the second book an attempt was made to include those who had adopted the Swiss type of reformation. It is hardly likely that the ordinary manual acts, apart from crossings and the like, were intended to be forbidden; but it seems quite certain that none were required. To this day the rubrical directions of the Communion Service are most incomplete. It is probably to this period that we must look back for an explanation of the fact.

The alterations in the Ordinal were of the same general character and tendency as those in the Communion Service. In the ordering of Deacons there is no change. In the ordering of Priests the only change is the omission of the order to deliver "the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand," the Bible alone being given.

In the Form of Consecrating a Bishop the habits of the ordinands and the consecrators are not mentioned in the second book ["the elected bishop having upon him a surplice and cope, shall be presented by two bishops being also in surplices and copes, and having their pastoral staves in their hands"—in the first book]. The only other differences are first, the delivering of the Bible to the consecrated bishop, instead of laying it upon his head, and the omission of the delivery of the pastoral staff, together with the short address by which it was accompanied.

The book was to come into use on All Saints' Day; and, as the King died early in July of the fol-

lowing year, it had a short nine months' life and probably in many parishes was never used at all.

The compiling of a set of doctrinal articles lay near to the heart of the young King, and an order of Council was issued in 1551; upon which Cranmer and Ridley took the work in hand, calling in the assistance of other divines. The articles as drawn up by them bear traces of Lutheran influence, although there seems no reason to suggest that concessions were made to the demands of foreign theologians. On May 2, 1552, the Council wrote to Cranmer, asking for the articles; upon which they were sent, that they might be laid before the King. After the King's chaplains had made some suggestions upon them, they were finally sent by Cranmer to the King towards the end of November, 1552. They were ratified by him and published by his command May 20, 1553, the delay having been occasioned by the fact that Convocation was not sitting at the time of their approval by the King. There seems no good reason to doubt that they were approved by Convocation, since they bear upon their face the statement that they were "agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men in the Synod of London in the year of our God 1552," probably in the month of March, 1553, according to our reckoning. It will be more convenient to reserve our remarks on the contents of the Forty-two Articles now published, until we come to consider the Thirty-nine of Elizabeth.

If we have devoted a considerable space to the examination and comparison of the two Prayer Books of Edward VI., it is because in these documents we

may read the inner history of a very important period of the English Reformation. No one would pretend to an understanding of the Christian Church from the third century onwards, who had not made himself acquainted with the decrees of the more important Councils; and so it is in the authoritative documents of the Anglican Church that we gain an insight into the influences by which her destinies were shaped. It is not that these books are now binding upon any one, or that Anglicans can lay hold upon the one or the other as representing the true Anglican doctrine and position. Yet it is more than a matter of historical interest that we should be able to trace the way by which the Providence of God guided this great Communion in her endeavor to bear a true witness for Him, and to conclusions which were ordained to exercise an influence so potent on the future history of Christian and human civilization.

The Duke of Somerset was brought to the scaffold on January 22, 1552. The King, his nephew, was sincerely attached to him, and with deep regret consented to his execution. Like many other men, who have enjoyed great popularity, he had many virtues and many vices. He was sincerely attached to the principles of the Reformation, which his successor only pretended to be; but his greed was immeasurable and his ambition boundless. He must be placed among those who helped to cast discredit on the work of reformation.

It is with little satisfaction that those who approve generally of the course taken by the work of reform

can survey its consequences up to the present time. It is quite possible that men living at the time may have exaggerated the prevalent evils, and at the same time may have overlooked the benefits which had flowed from the changed state of things. But it is no matter of surprise that so great a revolution should have shaken the faith of many, and so unsettled their moral principles; that the withdrawal of some of the old restraints should have bestowed upon many the fatal boon of a liberty which they could only abuse; whilst the alienation of much of the property of the Church was not only, to a large extent, inexpedient and mischievous, but must have produced the very worst effects upon those who profited immediately by that which must be called robbery and in some cases sacrilege.

If such expectations might be entertained with respect to the consequences of the Reformation, it would be no real condemnation of the movement, even if they should be found to be amply verified. Accordingly we hear of the distress to which the poor were reduced by the destruction of their places of refuge and the drying up of the sources from which they had been accustomed to receive relief. With examples like that of the man who stood next to the throne, it might well be that numbers of lesser men should endeavor to aggrandize and enrich themselves at the expense of the Church and the State. If a popular and religious nobleman like the Duke of Somerset attempted to seize the property of the Abbey of Westminster, and actually raised his great Somerset House on a foundation of plunder,

such peculation would be extended far and wide. Impartial testimonies from men of different schools reveal a state of things which is hardly credible. Fuller, in his Church History, tells us "that private men's halls were hung with altar-cloths, their tables and beds covered with copes. Many drank at their daily meals in chalices, and no wonder if, in proportion, it came to the share of their horses to be watered in coffins of marble." Of still greater force is the testimony of "old Hugh Latimer," one of the most faithful and unselfish of preachers. Speaking of "what hath been plucked from abbeyes, colleges, and chantries," he says it is marvelous that no more should be "bestowed on this holy office of Salvation;" and he goes on: "It may still be said of us what the Lord complaineth by his prophet, 'My house ye have deserted, and run every man to his own house.' What is Christ's house but Christian souls? But who maketh any provision for them? Every man scrapeth and getteth together for his bodily house, but the soul's health is neglected. Schools are not maintained. Scholars have not exhibition; the preaching office decayeth, men provide lands and riches for their children, but this most necessary office they neglect. If it be no better in time to come than hitherto looked unto, then England will at the last bewail it."

As far as it was possible for him, the King applied the funds arising from the various confiscations to purposes of charity and education. He refounded several hospitals, he set up and endowed Grammar Schools throughout the country. He is said, on

hearing a sermon from Bishop Ridley, to have sent for the preacher, and to have consulted him as to the best method of providing for the poor. But the bulk of the property taken from the Church went to fill the coffers of the hangers-on of the Court, and the great men who needed to be bribed to support the Reformation. One of the consequences was the shockingly incapable character of the men who were appointed to benefices. Hooper found, in his diocese, one hundred and sixty-eight priests who could not say the Ten Commandments. In some parishes, it is said, there had been no services since the friaries had been suppressed. Such was the state of matters when the reign of Edward VI. drew to its close.

No one can doubt either of the personal piety or of the great ability of Edward VI. It is indeed wonderful that one so young should have displayed such capacity, or that a child, coming to the throne at his tender years, and placed in such an environment, should have preserved the freshness and purity of his spiritual life. Whether by rational conviction or by education, he was also sincerely attached to the principles of the Reformation ; and so it came to pass, as his end drew near, that he was deeply concerned as to the fortunes of the Church, if his elder sister Mary should come to the throne. And this had been the arrangement made by his father, Henry VIII. : that, in case of Edward's dying without heir, Mary should succeed, and after her Elizabeth ; and, in case of all his children dying without heir, the descendants of his younger sister Mary should succeed.

The Princess Mary had shown the greatest stub-

bornness or firmness (according as we view the case) in relation to the Reformation ; and finally, when the English Prayer Books were published, she ignored the royal command, and had Mass said in her own chapel. When this was forbidden, her cousin, the Emperor interceded on her behalf, and the King's counsellors recommended that it would be better to ignore her disobedience and leave her to her discretion ; but the King, regarding the Mass as idolatrous, would not consent to what he regarded as a sin. Even Cranmer and Ridley gave him the same counsel. Every means was, at the same time, taken to bring the Princess to compliance with the established order of things, but in vain.

When it became probable that the life of the young King was drawing to an end, his great anxiety had reference to the prospects of religion and the Church. At this time, and since the downfall of Somerset, the chief power behind the throne was Dudley, Earl of Warwick, now become Duke of Northumberland. This nobleman had married his fourth son, Lord Guildford Dudley, to Lady Jane Grey, eldest daughter of the Duke of Suffolk, whose wife, Frances Brandon, was the daughter of Mary, the younger sister of Henry VIII. by her (second) marriage to Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. When the Duke of Northumberland saw the King's anxiety as to the future of the Church, he and his supporters pressed upon him to settle the crown upon Lady Jane Grey, the Duchess of Suffolk, her mother, being ready to waive her own rights in favor of her eldest daughter. It is not known how they

induced King Edward to set aside his sister Elizabeth, to whom he was much attached, and who was known to favor the Reformation; however, they succeeded.

The King then summoned the Council with certain of the judges and told them of his decision. At first, the legal authorities declared that the Act of succession, being an Act of Parliament, could not be set aside by the King's letters patent; and on further examining the statutes, they found that to change the succession, not only after the King's death but during his life, was treason; so that they declined to have any part in it. In spite of the angry remonstrances and threats of Northumberland, the judges held to their opinion, Mountague, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, proposing that the matter should be delayed until Parliament should meet. But the King determined to have it done first, and then ratified by Parliament. Mountague at last consented to draw up the required document on two conditions, first, that he should have a commission from the King requiring him to do it, and secondly, a pardon under the great seal when it was done. Both of these were granted, and he obeyed, the other judges except Hales concurring, Gosnald, the last to fall in, being constrained by the threats of the Duke of Northumberland and the Earl of Shrewsbury. The document was signed by the members of the Council and by most of the judges. Cranmer, satisfied of the illegality of the procedure, absented himself, and subsequently declared that he would never consent to the disinheriting of

the daughters of his late master. Cecil was induced to sign as a witness, and, when Cranmer, yielding to the King's importunities, reluctantly affixed his name, it is probable that he was allowed the same privilege.

Edward died (July 6, 1553) as he had lived, "that incomparable young Prince," with faith in God, and submission to His will, yet not without forebodings as to the future of the Church. Whether his death was ultimately an injury to the English Church may be questioned. He was the only Puritan King that England ever had, and, if his opinions had remained unchanged, it can hardly be doubted that he would have favored the carrying of the Reformation further. It is useless, however, to speculate on such contingencies. The Providence of God ordered it otherwise. His plans for the succession miscarried. The proclamation of the nine days' Queen served only to make the throne of Mary more secure, and give her more absolute control of the government in Church and State.

CHAPTER XV.

ACCESSION OF MARY.



ANY influences combined to make the English people welcome Mary as their Queen. The conduct of the reforming party had done something to alienate all classes in the community from a movement, in which the promoters, while professing to purify the Church, were aggrandizing themselves and robbing the country in the most barefaced manner. Moreover, the sense of justice and the conservative spirit of the people combined to resent the deprival of the two daughters of Henry VIII. of the rights assured to them by Act of Parliament.

But this was not all. The Duke of Northumberland had become deservedly unpopular, by his compassing the destruction of the Duke of Somerset and especially by his treachery in securing Lady Jane Grey, a child of sixteen, of great beauty, intelligence, and virtue, but very subject to the authority of her elders, as wife of his fourth son, Lord Guildford Dudley, and having her proclaimed Queen. The Duke of Northumberland need not detain us longer. It is sufficient to add that, although he had promoted the Protestant movement to the utmost during the life of King Edward, and had made his zeal for the Reformation a reason for his advising the settlement of the succession on Lady Jane Grey,

when he was brought to the block, he declared himself a Roman Catholic.

Mary came to the throne deeply embittered against the Reformation and having no real sympathy with the people whom she had to govern.¹ She was half a Spaniard in blood, and altogether a Spaniard in nature. She never forgot the cruel wrongs suffered by her mother; and she clung, with all the energy of her narrow but resolute nature, to her mother's religion. She not merely held all the doctrinal tenets of the Church of Rome, as her father had done, but she held as firmly to the supremacy of the Pope, although, for a short time, she seemed to assume to herself the place of Head of the Church. If Edward was the only Puritan Sovereign that England has ever had, Mary was the only papal sovereign, the only one who completely and unreservedly conceded to the Pope all that he claimed and demanded.

It is quite likely that Mary might have found it difficult if not impossible to carry out her own designs, but for the rebellion which she had so easily suppressed. The leading men of the old learning, such as Gardiner and Bonner, wanted simply to restore things as they had been under Henry VIII. It is doubtful, whether, as has been alleged, they wished to go back to the time before Henry's breach with the papacy. They had gone heartily with the King in the assertion of the Royal Supremacy: they were even disposed to discourage many of the popu-

¹The picture of Mary in Tennyson's play of "Queen Mary," is admirable for its truth and completeness.

ular superstitions of the age. But they were not prepared to accept the results of the Edwardine Reformation, and the Queen had no thought of ultimately tolerating anything which had been done to the disparagement of the papal authority.

Although one of the new Queen's first acts was to liberate the imprisoned bishops, and although she had Mass said openly before her, yet she did not at once alter the order of things established under her brother's reign. Cranmer was permitted to conduct the funeral service of Edward according to the revised Prayer Book, and the public services of the Church were, for a time, carried on in English. The sermon at King Edward's funeral was preached by Bishop Day, now at liberty. He lauded the King, and threw all the blame of what had been done upon his Council, praising the new Queen greatly and promising the people happy days under her rule. Shortly afterwards (August 12) she declared in Council that, although she would maintain her own faith and worship, she would put no compulsion upon others. Yet she trusted that by the word of God, expounded by godly and learned preachers, her people might come to be of her faith.

But soon an incident occurred which showed that such neutrality would not long be possible. When Bonner, with the other deposed bishops, was restored to his see, he went to St. Paul's on Sunday, August 13, where Bourne his chaplain preached the sermon. In preaching he spoke sharply of the proceedings against Bonner in the previous reign; and this provoked the people who disliked Bonner and idol-

ized the memory of Edward, so that a great tumult arose in the Cathedral. One man threw a dagger at the preacher, which stuck in the wood of the pulpit, Bourne saving himself by stooping down. The people were quieted by the influence of Rogers and another by whom the preacher was conducted in safety from the Church.

This occurrence gave the Queen an excuse, which was probably welcome to her, for putting a stop to preaching; and therefore (August 18) she put forth a proclamation prohibiting religious discussions. She declared that, although she was of the same religion she had always professed, and would maintain it, yet "she did not intend to compel any of her subjects to it, till public order should be taken in it by common consent; requiring all, in the meanwhile, not to move sedition or unquietness till such order should be settled; and not to use the name of papist or heretic, but to live together in love and in the fear of God." She further threatened to punish any who "made assemblies of the people," or preached or circulated books without her licence; and hoped she might not be driven to the "extreme execution of the laws," hinting that some might be called to account for participation in the late rebellion, a very far-reaching threat.

Such a proclamation meant the silencing of all the Protestant preachers in England, who were little likely to obtain a licence, if they applied for it. Gardiner, who had been appointed Lord Chancellor, received commission (August 29) to grant licences under the great seal to such grave, learned and dis-

creet persons as he should think meet and able to preach God's word; which clearly meant that not only would the reformers be refused licences, but that men of opposite opinions would be appointed to occupy their pulpits. As a consequence, several of them continued to preach without licence, while some said prayers in church and gave instructions in private. The Council, learning that their orders had been disregarded, sent for the accused and committed them to prison. Bishop Hooper was also sent to the Fleet (September 1) and Coverdale of Exeter ordered to wait their pleasure.

One of the hardest cases was that of Judge Hales, who had held out to the last against Edward's disposition of the Crown, standing up for the rights of Mary. Thinking that one so loyal might safely speak his mind, he gave a charge to the Justices of the Peace at the Quarter Sessions in Kent, that they should see to the execution of King Edward's laws which were still unrepealed and in force. He was rewarded for his former fidelity by being sent first to the King's Bench and afterwards to the Fleet. Here he was so excited by what he was told of the prospects of recusants, that he endeavored to take away his life, and, although he was afterwards, on his submission, released, he never recovered his self-control, and not long after drowned himself.

While some thought it their duty to disregard the Queen's proclamation, others sought for safety on the continent. Peter Martyr was so roughly handled at Oxford that he fled for safety to Lambeth, where, however, Cranmer was very uncertain of being able

to protect himself. The position of the Archbishop was one of great difficulty. On the one hand, the doctrine against which he had contended was now reestablished by the celebration of the Mass; yet he felt a difficulty about provoking a controversy with the authority of the Queen. So it got abroad that he was ready to do whatever she might command. Bonner, in his insolent way, writes to a correspondent (Sept. 6), "Mr. Canterbury was become very humble, and ready to submit himself in all things; but that would not serve his turn; and it was expected he should be sent to the Tower that very day." Cranmer was strongly recommended to save himself by flight, which might still have been possible; but he said, considering his position, and what hand he had in all the changes that were made, it would be an indecent thing for him to fly.

Before this he had been twice summoned before the Council, in the month of August, and interrogated on the part he had taken in securing the succession to Lady Jane, and again on the possession of his see. No further measures were then taken except to require him to remain in his palace at Lambeth. The report having gone abroad that the Latin Mass was again celebrated in Canterbury Cathedral, by his authority, he drew up a statement on the subject. The Mass, he said, had not been set up at Canterbury by his order, but by "a fawning hypocritical Monk," namely Thornton, Bishop Suffragan of Dover. He maintained that, whilst Henry VIII. had begun the work of reform, his son had brought it to a further perfection; and that now the Lord's

Supper was celebrated as it had been in the primitive Church. Moreover, he offers, with Peter Martyr, to defend the Book of Common Prayer and the other rites of their service; and also the whole doctrine and order of religion set forth by the late King, as more pure and agreeable to the Word of God than any sort of religion that had been in England for a thousand years.

Cranmer stated afterwards that he intended to revise his Tract and publish it. But he showed it to Scory, who had been Bishop of Chichester, wishing to obtain his judgment upon it. Scory, without the Archbishop's leave, circulated the paper, and on the 5th of September a copy was publicly read in Cheapside. On the 8th of that month he was summoned before the Star Chamber, and asked if he was the author of that seditious bill, and if so, whether he was sorry for it. He confessed that it was his, and regretted that it had been published prematurely, as he had intended to enlarge it and to fix it at the door of St. Paul's and the other Churches of London with his hand and seal to it. For the time he was dismissed.

It was then seriously debated what should be done with the Archbishop. There was a danger in proceeding with too great harshness against one held in so much esteem, and this was Gardiner's view. To others it seemed necessary that one who had been the ringleader in heresy should not escape lest others should be encouraged in their obstinacy. But there was one thing that Mary could neither forget nor forgive, and that was the part that Cranmer had taken in the divorce of her mother. Accordingly,

he and Latimer were summoned before the Council on the 13th of September. On that day Latimer was committed. On the following day Cranmer was sent to the Tower for matters of treason against the Queen and for circulating seditious bills.

Less severe measures were taken with the foreign Protestants who had been allowed to settle in England during the previous reign. Peter Martyr was allowed to depart for the Continent. John à Lasco and his congregation were ordered to leave the country; and the history of their departure casts a sad light on the history and fortunes of the Reformation movement. A hundred and seventy-five of them sailed in two ships to Denmark, where the Lutheran type of Reformation had been established. They were received with as little hospitality as if they had landed in a Roman Catholic country, when it was found that they were of the Helvetian Confession; and, although it was in the month of December, and a very severe winter, they were required to take themselves off in two days, and were not permitted to leave even their wives and children for a time behind them. They proceeded successively to Lübeck, Wismar, and Hamburg, "where they found the disputes about the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament had raised such violent animosities, that, after much barbarous usage, they were banished out of all these towns," and at last found a resting place in Friesland. Is it wonderful that the Reformation movement, which at one time seemed likely to sweep all over Europe, should come to a stop, and even be driven back? Well might Bossuet write on the

variations of Protestants! Well might their adversaries say they were animated by self-will, and not by obedience to God and His Gospel!

The Queen was crowned on the 1st of October by Gardiner; and on that day she issued a proclamation in which, after referring very artfully to the large expenditure and heavy demands upon the nation which had been rendered necessary by the bad government of her brother's Counsellors, and the necessities of the country, she said, she would remit the subsidies which were now due to her, out of love for her subjects and desire for their good will.

Parliament assembled October 5th, being summoned by the Queen as still "Supreme Head of the Church." Most of the reformed bishops were in prison. Two only, Taylor, of Lincoln, and Hawley, of Hereford, were there. When the Mass began, they withdrew, and were never allowed to take their places again. Another account says that Taylor was there in his robes; but, as he refused to pay any reverence to the Mass, he was forcibly expelled from the house.

It would appear that a determined effort was made, on this occasion, to obtain a Parliament favorable to the policy of the Queen. Threats and violence were used to prevent freedom of voting: false returns were made: some were turned out of the House of Commons, so that it might well be doubted whether its acts would be valid. In spite of all this the Parliament was not found so tractable as had been desired; and very little was done. The Parliament was prorogued from the 21st to the 24th of October; and on

the 26th a Bill to annul the divorce of Catharine from Henry, and so to legitimize the Queen, was sent down from the Lords, and was passed by the Commons on the 28th. The marriage was declared to be a quite lawful one, its condemnation had been obtained by evil means, and the sentence given by Cranmer was unlawful, and of no force from the beginning; so that now the acts of Parliament which had confirmed it were repealed. This was done by Gardiner who, with the greatest effrontery, ignored the fact that he had been as much concerned in the divorce as Cranmer, indeed he was forwarding the measure before Cranmer had any hand in it, and he had as little dared to resist the will of King Henry.

The quashing of the divorce had the effect of annulling the King's marriage to Anne Boleyn, by which means the Princess Elizabeth was rendered illegitimate. She had been declared to be so at the time of her mother's execution; but the disposition of the succession by Henry, confirmed by Parliament, had taken off this disqualification. Up to this time it is said that Mary had borne herself affectionately towards Elizabeth, partly, perhaps, because they were both exposed to similar dangers; but from this time she treated her with greater harshness, and indeed at a subsequent period she seems to have been in some danger. Whether the change in her conduct was brought about by the alteration in her legal status is uncertain. Some have thought that it was the result of personal jealousy. Courtenay, Earl of Devon, was at this time so great a favorite that it was thought the Queen wished to marry him; but

the Lady Elizabeth was nineteen years younger and better favored, so his Lordship paid court to her, which afterwards brought them both into trouble.

And now a beginning was made with ecclesiastical legislation. A sweeping measure was introduced for the repeal of all the laws of this character passed during the reign of Edward VI. The House of Lords seems to have passed this Bill without difficulty, the reforming bishops being in prison, and some of the reformed peers being in danger of their necks through the rebellion. In the House of Commons it was debated hotly for about a week, and a considerable minority voted against it. It carried, however, and it was enacted that, from the 20th of December next, there should be no form of service in churches but that which had been used in the last year of King Henry VIII. Until that time they might use either of the Books sanctioned by King Edward or the Latin service, at their pleasure.

Several other Acts were now passed, the Parliament apparently being ready to go all lengths. An Act was passed forbidding the molesting of priests, condemning the abuse of the Holy Sacrament, the breaking of altars, crucifixes, and crosses, under penalty of three months' imprisonment. The Commons in their zeal sent up another Bill to the House of Lords against those who should neglect to come to Church or to the Sacraments after the old service should be restored. This was thrown out by the House of Lords from the fear that the nation might be alarmed at the sudden passing of laws of such severity, rather than from any disinclination to the

measure on the part of the peers. Another Act was passed against unlawful assemblies, to the effect that, if any, to the number of twelve or above, should meet to alter anything of religion established by law, and should refuse to disperse when required by any having the Queen's authority, remaining after that an hour together, it should be felony.

Convocation showed a spirit even more opposed to the Reformation. It is probable that the majority of the clergy had never been quite favorable to the changes, and now the leaders of the reforming party were in prison or out of the country. On the 20th of October two resolutions were brought before the House, the one asserting the presence of the natural Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, the other condemning the Catechism falsely pretended to be set forth by the late Convocation. It was contended by Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, that the Catechism had been approved by a committee appointed to act for Convocation; and he and four others declined to sign the declaration as to Transubstantiation, demanding a public discussion on the subject, in which they requested that Bishop Ridley, Rogers, and some others should be allowed to take part. The challenge was declined.

On the 13th of November, Archbishop Cranmer, Lord Guildford Dudley and Lady Jane, and two brothers of Lord Guildford were brought to trial for treason. They all pleaded guilty, Cranmer urging that he had consented unwillingly, submitting himself to the Queen's mercy. It is not quite easy to determine why Mary did not now proceed to inflict

upon Cranmer and the others the penalty of treason. It has been said that she was not naturally bloodthirsty until her fanaticism was aroused; but it is difficult to believe that she had forgiven the dishonor done by Cranmer to her mother. She was indeed under great personal obligation to the Archbishop who, it is believed, actually saved her life, when her father, incensed at her obstinacy, threatened her with death; and she may have wished to show her gratitude for this favor. Whatever the reason may have been, Cranmer was not actually deprived of the Archbishopric, but its fruits were sequestered, and he was retained in prison. The other accused persons were also sent back to prison.

About this time negotiations seem to have been opened with the Pope, in order to effect a reconciliation between the Church of England and the see of Rome. Mary did not conceal her own wishes, but she pointed out to the Pope's representatives that it was necessary to proceed in the matter with great caution; and not to lose England, as they had done before, by too much stiffness. By way of keeping such communication open, it was proposed to send Pole as legate to England; but this was opposed by Gardiner, who represented to the Emperor that things were going quite well, and this might spoil all. The Emperor had his own designs which, for the time, fell in with Gardiner's advice.

It was about this time that Charles V., the Queen's first cousin, began to entertain the idea of marrying his son Philip to Mary, who was now thirty-seven and nearly twelve years older than

Philip. It was a match which had great attractions for the Emperor, if not entirely for his son, and the realization of it became a passion with Mary. On the one hand, the Emperor saw that an alliance with England would be of the greatest advantage to Spain politically and commercially, and would curb the power of France. On the other hand, the Queen saw in such a union the surest way to a reconciliation with Rome, and the restoration of the papal power in England. The Emperor, fearing that Pole's mission might interfere with these designs, got the Queen to stop him, on the ground that precipitancy might defeat the end which they had in view.

From the beginning of her reign the Queen had two possible courses before her. She might have carried on the system sanctioned by her father, keeping her own place as Head or Supreme Governor of the Church; and in this course she would probably have had the support of the great majority of her people. The English nation was not yet Protestant, although it was anti-papal. It was reserved for Mary herself to bring to maturity the seeds of Protestantism and Puritanism, which were but scanty and weak before her reign. Had she stuck to this course, which she seemed to take at first, and which was supported by Gardiner and most of the bishops and divines of the old learning, she might have practically extinguished the doctrinal reformation in England. But this was not her intention. From the very first, she designed to go back not to the last years of her father, even to his reactionary period, but to the time before the break with Rome. Such

was her fixed purpose, of which she never lost sight; and she saw in her marriage with Philip the means of bringing it to effect; but she also soon got to know that such a marriage was hateful to her people.

The Spanish marriage was not only distasteful to the friends of the Reformation: it was equally disliked by those who cared for the civil liberties of the people, since they feared that England would become little more than a province of Spain. The general discontent broke out in the rebellion headed by Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Duke of Suffolk (Lady Jane's father), and Sir Peter Carew. At first the rising seemed not unlikely to succeed, but it was speedily suppressed. It cost the lives of Lord Guildford, his wife, her father, and many others. The Lady Jane died in a manner worthy of her nobility and piety; and it was only the reflection that the Queen had been driven to take her life that prevented a violent reaction against her. The Judge, Morgan, by whom she was sentenced is said to have gone mad in consequence. The Earl of Devon and the Princess of Elizabeth were suspected of complicity in the plot, but Wyatt cleared them of the suspicion. But the Queen made it a pretext for casting her sister into prison in the tower. She had the saddest forebodings of the fate intended for her, but shortly after was removed and placed under the care of those who would be answerable for her.

Mary's second Parliament met on the 2d of April, 1554. It was believed that many of the members were bribed to vote in favor of the marriage. But the first proceeding was to declare the authority of

the Queen to be equal to that of a King. Various reasons were assigned for this, among others, that Philip, who claimed descent from John of Gaunt, might set aside the Queen, and assert his own right of governing.

One of the most remarkable incidents of this period was the discussion of the nature of the Eucharist which had been mismanaged in the previous Convocation. It was resolved to adjourn this Convocation and send the prolocutor and some other members to Oxford that the discussion might take place before the whole university. For this purpose Cranmer and Ridley were removed from the Tower to the prison at Oxford. Latimer was also sent to take part in the debate. Three propositions were offered for discussion: "1. In the Sacrament of the Altar, by virtue of the divine word spoken by the Priest, there is present really, under the forms of bread and wine, the natural Body of Christ which was conceived by the Virgin Mary, also His natural Blood. 2. After Consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance, except the substance of Christ, God and man. 3. In the Mass is the life-giving propitiatory sacrifice for the sins both of the living and the dead." It has been thought that the whole proceeding was a device by which the bishops might be led so to commit themselves that a charge of heresy might be founded on their words.

The disputation was held in the chancel of the University Church (April 16, 1554). Cranmer insisted on the figurative meaning of the words that

spoke of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament. The prolocutor, Weston, behaved with great insolence, speaking of the Archbishop as unlearned and unskilful. Many in the audience also hissed him, of which he took no notice. The whole proceedings, which lasted from the morning until two o'clock, were of the most disorderly character.

The next day Ridley was called. He declared that formerly he had held the mediæval view, but that he had changed by conviction and for no worldly consideration. What he held he had gathered from the Word of God and the Fathers; and he asked that he might be permitted to speak without interruption. This was assured to him; but the promise was not kept. It was said to be a powerful speech, containing all the principal arguments for his opinion. The dispute between him and Smith was stopped by Weston, who, in his usual abusive manner, sneered insultingly at Ridley, and asked the audience to join in exclaiming with him: "Truth has the victory." Next day Latimer spoke, saying, he was too old to argue, but he would state his convictions which he had long ago arrived at, and now held fast. The whole proceedings were as before most disorderly.

On the 20th of April the three bishops were again brought to St. Mary's Church, and were required by the Commissioners to sign the propositions which had been set forth for debate, on the ground that they had been refuted. Cranmer declared that he had had no liberty of disputation, since they would not listen to his arguments, as many as four or five of them interrupting him at once. In conclusion, he

refused to subscribe. So did Ridley and Latimer; and they were all three pronounced guilty of heresy, and declared to be excommunicated. They solemnly appealed from that judgment and sentence to the just judgment of Almighty God; and they all prepared themselves for death, which they knew to be the sequel to their condemnation.

An attempt was made to get up a similar discussion at Cambridge with Hooper, Rogers, and others; but, as they knew what had taken place at Oxford, they refused to repeat the farce; while at the same time they gave utterance to their convictions on the subjects in debate.

On the 20th of July Prince Philip landed at Southampton. When the Mayor delivered the keys of the town into his hands, as was customary when princes visited a place, he gave them back without speaking a word or expressing any pleasure. This was not the deportment to which Englishmen were accustomed from their princes; and the coldness and austerity of the Spaniard struck a chill into the hearts of the people, which he took no pains afterwards to remove. Mary met him at Winchester, and they were there married by Gardiner, July 25, 1554, their ages being respectively twenty-seven and thirty-eight; and on the 27th they were proclaimed: "Philip and Mary, King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; Princes of Spain and Sicily, Defenders of the faith; Archdukes of Austria; Dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant; Counts of Hapsburg, Flanders, and Tyrol."

CHAPTER XVI.

THE MARIAN PERSECUTION.

HE marriage of Mary Tudor with Prince Philip of Spain marks the beginning of a new epoch in English Church history. The Queen had the English reaction on her side, a servile Parliament ready to do her bidding, and the power of Spain behind her in case of force being needed. Nor was it only the military power of his people that Philip could command. Although he never gained any kind of popularity with the English, yet he brought with him arguments which all could understand in the form of a vast treasure, consisting of seven and twenty chests of bullion, every chest more than a yard long, drawn in twenty carts to the Tower; and after that ninety-nine horses and two carts, loaded with gold and silver coins. But still more than by his money Philip was commended to the regard of the English people by his intercessions with the Queen on behalf of many persons in prison, and more particularly the Princess Elizabeth and Courtenay, Earl of Devon. Gardiner, who detested Elizabeth almost as much as he did Cranmer, would have it that Wyatt's original accusation was to be believed, and not his recantation at the scaffold, since he knew that the reaction was not safe while Elizabeth was alive. Philip, in

interceding for the Princess, now only one and twenty, was doubtless moved by simple compassion. But this feeling may have been reinforced by the consideration that the death of Elizabeth would have removed an obstacle to the future accession of Mary Queen of Scots, and so to the aggrandizement of France.

Mary's third Parliament assembled on the 1st of November, and on the 22d the attainder of Pole was removed, so that he could now appear in England as papal legate. Care was taken, before his appearance, to appease the alarm of those who had got possession of Church lands; and the legate arrived furnished with a Bull empowering him to "give, aliene, and transfer" all Church property to its present holders.

On the 28th he met the Parliament, and made a long speech, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see. Next day the Speaker reported to the Commons the substance of the speech; and a petition containing an address to the King and Queen, was drawn up by a committee, and approved by both houses, confessing the "horrible defection and schism" of the country "from the apostolic see," of which they now sincerely repented, and declaring their readiness "to repeal all the laws made in prejudice of that see." The address proceeded to plead that "as the King and Queen had been in no way defiled by their schism, they pray them to be intercessors with the Legate to grant them absolution, and to receive them again into the bosom of the Church."

On the following day, November 30, the King,

Queen, and Legate were present, the Queen on the throne. The Chancellor read the petition to the King and Queen: they also addressed the Cardinal; and he, after a long speech, setting forth the evils of the Reformation, and enjoining them, as penance, the repealing of the laws which they had made, absolved "all those present, and the whole nation, and the dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and all judgments, censures, and penalties for that cause incurred; and restored them to the communion of Holy Church, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The members received the absolution on their knees, and a loud "Amen" declared their satisfaction. A *Te Deum* was chanted immediately afterwards in the Chapel of the House, in thanksgiving for the reconciliation now effected (December 6, 1554).

On application from the Convocation to the King and Queen, the Legate was induced to grant a ratification of the possession of the Abbey lands by their present tenants. He published an instrument (December 24, 1554), declaring: "1. That all cathedrals, colleges, and schools founded during the schism should be preserved. 2. That all marriages contracted within the prohibited degrees, but sanctioned by the existing laws, should be valid. 3. That all institutions into benefices should be confirmed. 4. That all judicial processes should be confirmed. 5. That all the settlements of the lands of any bishoprics, monasteries, or other religious houses, might continue to be held without any impediment or trouble from the ecclesiastical laws."

These enactments were embodied in the same Act of Parliament which restored the papal supremacy. The Cardinal, not unnaturally, wished to keep these two things apart; but the English nobility would have them united, taking care that an act which might be quoted in support of the claims of the papacy, should also assert their right to the possessions alienated from the Church. This Act also repealed all previous Acts inconsistent with its contents, declared that the title of Supreme Head of the Church never rightfully belonged to the Crown, restored all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and suspended the Statute of mortmain for twenty years. It was a shameful kind of transaction, although it might be urged in support of the provision last mentioned, that it gave the Church an opportunity of gaining back some portion of her lost property.

Although Mary had gone further in the path of reaction than her people really liked, yet they had become so weary of perpetual changes that they might finally have settled down under the Roman obedience, but for the persecutions by which it was resolved to punish heretics and bring back wanderers to the fold. As has been said, it was the Marian persecution which made England Protestant.

The blame for the instituting of these most cruel and unnecessary barbarities has been laid upon different persons, more particularly upon Gardiner and Bonner, and undoubtedly they seem to have entered upon the work with few compunctions, and probably regarded the sacrifice of men like Cranmer with considerable satisfaction. There seems no doubt, how-

ever, that the real source of the persecutions was in the cold fanaticism of Mary, sustained by the complete sympathy and concurrence of her husband.

First of all, the Act of Henry IV. against heretics was revived, the House of Commons being eager to do more in that way than they were allowed to do. Next came the Bill of Treasons, by which any one who should deny the King's right to the title of the Crown with the Queen's, was to forfeit all his goods, and be imprisoned for life. It was also enacted that, if the Queen died, leaving issue before her children had come of age, the government should be in the hands of the King, until the son was eighteen, or the daughter fifteen years of age; and the conspiring against his life, during that time, was to be treason. Another Act was passed against seditious words, and another against the spreading of lying reports concerning any noblemen, judges, or great officers. Any who were guilty of such offences were to be placed in the pillory and pay a fine of a hundred pounds, or have their ears cut off, and be imprisoned for a month.

Care was taken to give the Cardinal a commission, under the great seal, to act as Legate, that it might be pleaded that the Statute of Præmunire was not violated. Pole, too, was anxious to comport himself in a conciliatory manner toward his fellow-countrymen, and was naturally a man disinclined to cruelty or harsh treatment of opponents. When the question of punishing heresy came up, he opposed extreme measures, saying that pastors should have compassion even upon the straying sheep, that bishops

were fathers who should regard those who went astray as their sick children. Moreover he had observed that measures of great severity, used to bring back the disobedient, had generally had a contrary effect. It was more necessary, he thought, to have a reformation of the Clergy than to have a persecution of the heretical. It is said that Gardiner had been irritated by the republication of his book on True Obedience, written in the reign of Henry VIII. in defence of the royal supremacy, and took the side of severity; and that the Queen thought that methods of conciliation and methods of severity should be tried together. At last it was determined to bring some of the prominent reformers now in prison to trial.

Accordingly a commission was issued by the Legate (January 29, 1555) to Bishop Gardiner and others named to proceed to the trial of heretics. The first to be tried were Hooper, formerly Bishop of Gloucester, and Rogers, Prebendary of St. Paul's, who had helped to protect Bourne from the fury of the mob at the beginning of this reign, and who is believed to be the editor of the English translation of the Bible, published under the name of Matthew. The real accusation against these men, and nearly all who suffered in this reign, was that they denied the ecclesiastical doctrine of Transubstantiation, the "corporal presence of the Body and Blood of Christ" in the Eucharist. They persisted in denying this doctrine, after being given a night to consider the case, and so they were condemned as heretics, degraded, excommunicated, and handed over to

the civil power to be executed. Rogers asked to be allowed to see his wife ; but he was told she was not his wife and was refused. He was offered a pardon if he would recant, which he refused to do, and was burned at Smithfield, February 4, 1555.

The effect on the people was very different from what the originators of the persecutions had hoped, if we may credit the testimony of de Noailles, the French Ambassador. "This day," he says, "was celebrated the confirmation of the alliance between the Pope and this Kingdom, by the public and solemn sacrifice of a doctor and preacher named Rogers, who was burned alive for holding Lutheran opinions, persisting till death in his sentiments. At this constancy the people were so delighted that they did not fear to strengthen his courage by their acclamations, even his own children joining, and consoling him after such a fashion, that it seemed as though they were conducting him to his nuptials."

Hooper was taken to his own cathedral city of Gloucester, and endured his lingering death with great heroism and patience. The wood was green and the wind blew the flames on one side, and the dying martyr mingled his prayers to the Lord Jesus with entreaties for more fire. He was nearly three quarters of an hour burning: his last audible words were: "Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit."

Sanders, who had persisted in preaching in spite of the Queen's prohibition, was sent to Coventry to be burned. He was offered a pardon if he would recant his heresies ; but he said he held no heresies ; but only the blessed Gospel of Christ, and that he

would never recant. He embraced the stake with the words, "Welcome the Cross of Christ, welcome everlasting life." Taylor, who came next, was incumbent of Hadley, and when a neighboring priest came to say Mass in his Church, he went and protested against it, but was finally removed from the Church. Gardiner sent for him and treated him to some of his favorite words of abuse; and sent him for trial to the King's Bench, where he was condemned and sentenced to be burned in his own parish. His wife and children were waiting for him in the street, and a touching scene took place, after which he bade them farewell, his wife declaring that she would see him at Hadley. There he found the whole country assembled; and "when the people saw his reverend and ancient face, with a long white beard, they burst out with weeping tears, and cried, saying, 'God save thee, good Dr. Taylor; God strengthen thee and help thee; the Holy Ghost comfort thee!'" He was shamefully struck and maltreated by his executioners, so that he fell dead into the fire before the flames had consumed him. These four were the first of the Marian Martyrs, and they all died with cheerful confidence and resignation. Gardiner was soon sick of the business, especially when he found that the effect of the burnings was the very reverse of what he had hoped; and so he left the work to Bonner, "who," it is said, "undertook it cheerfully."

One pleasing incident in connection with these persecutions was the reconciliation between Hooper and Ridley. It will be remembered that Ridley had

vainly endeavored to bring his friend to a reasonable view of the question of the vestments. This controversy had led to some heat and even to a degree of alienation between them; but the approach of death brought them to think but little of such differences. Hooper wrote twice to Ridley during his imprisonment; and the latter answered him as soon as he could find opportunity, saying that the division between them had been caused by Hooper's wisdom and his own simplicity; but now he assured him how dearly he loved him in the truth and for the truth. He bid him be of good courage and prepare for the day of his dissolution, after which they should triumph together in eternal glory. At the same time he expressed his joy and thankfulness for what he had heard of Cranmer's "godly and fatherly constancy."

It may seem surprising that these burnings occasioned such widespread horror and consternation throughout the country, when it is remembered that several had suffered the same punishment in the reign of Henry VIII. and one in the reign of Edward. But it was not only the wholesale character of the burnings and the cruelties by which they were accompanied, that shocked the public sentiment, although these did much. In the late reign those dissenting from the dominant religion had only been sent to prison. Neither party had learned the lesson of religious liberty; but the adherents of Rome seemed determined to show that they could carry on the work of persecution with a deadly thoroughness which their antagonists did not understand.

We have referred more than once to the question which has frequently been discussed as to the originators of the persecutions; and perhaps we may say that all the leaders, such as Gardiner, and probably still more Bonner, must be held responsible for them, yet the chief promoters of the cruel burnings were Philip and Mary; and Gardiner did not hesitate to lay the blame on the Queen. Philip tried to clear himself by getting his chaplain to preach against capital punishment for heresy; but there can be no reason to believe that this was anything more than a device to turn the odium away from the King. As regards the Queen, we have her answer to the Council in regard to the punishment of heretics, in which she says that "it ought to be done without rashness, not leaving in the meantime to do justice to such as, by learning, would seem to deceive the simple," clearly meaning that Cranmer and the bishops should be looked to. She concludes by saying that "especially within London I would wish none to be burned without some of the Council's presence, and both there and everywhere good sermons at the same time." We imagine that most people would prefer the alleged ferocity of Bonner to the cold fanaticism of Mary. This letter of the Queen's, we should remark, was written towards the end of 1554, and before the appointment of the commission which was in the January following.

The burning of Taylor was in February. Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's, was burned in March at Carmarthen. Then came a pause; but again in May the Council stirs up the bishops to proceed with

their work, an exhortation which the more tender-hearted ignored, whilst others acted upon it. In June the burnings at Smithfield began again. It would serve no purpose to dwell upon the details. In some of the dioceses, through the clemency of the bishops, none were put to death, in others many. During the four years (1555-1558) of the persecution, one hundred and twenty-eight were burned in the diocese of London, fifty-five in Canterbury, forty-six in Norwich, and much smaller numbers in the other dioceses, altogether two hundred and eighty-six, of whom forty-six were women. Under Tunstall of Durham and the bishops of Lincoln, Carlisle, Bath and Wells, Hereford and Worcester, no burnings took place. It is much to be feared that Pole, who had been suspected of sympathy with the Reformation movement, and who had no real inclination to persecution, yet came over to that side in order to prove at Rome his loyalty to the Church, and so increase his prospects of ascending the papal chair, which was the object of his ambition. After a time the form of persecution became worse, the Queen giving orders that recantation should not save the life of a heretic.

The trials of Ridley, Latimer, and especially of Cranmer being for various reasons postponed, some of those who had escaped to the continent drew up a petition to the Queen, warning her against the evil of persecuting Christians. They reminded her that Cranmer had saved her life in her father's time, so that she had good reason to believe in his attachment to herself. They pointed out that Gar-

diner and Bonner had written against the supremacy of the Pope, and in favor of the divorce. They said that Christians were better treated in Turkey than they were in Christian England; and they reminded her that the members of her own communion had not been treated in this manner under King Edward; and finally that God had entrusted her with the power of the sword for the protection of her people while they did well. The address then warns the nobility of their danger of losing their lands (taken from the Church) and their liberties, as was happening in the Netherlands. The people are next warned; and the Queen is entreated to be at least as favorable to her own subjects as she had been to foreigners, and give them leave to quit the country for foreign parts.

An answer was published in defence of the Queen's action, in a book entitled, "A Defence of the Proceedings against Heretics." It was here set forth that the punishment of heretics was lawful and necessary since the Jews were commanded to put blasphemers to death; and these heretics were guilty of blasphemy, since they called the body of Christ a piece of bread. The heathens had persecuted Christians: ought not the zeal of those who professed a true religion to be greater? St. Peter had, by a divine power, struck dead Ananias and Sapphira; and various other examples were given of the like course of proceeding.

The work went on until even Bonner grew weary of killing without any result save the exhibition of the constancy of the sufferers, the growing sympathy

of the people, and the deepening hatred of himself and his religion. Consequently, he began to refuse to investigate any further cases; but he was not permitted to have his own way. On May 24 (1555) the King and Queen wrote to him, admonishing him to have more regard to the office of a good pastor and bishop, and to do his best to bring back the wanderers or else to proceed against them according to law. Bonner is said to have made up for lost time.

A great proportion of the Marian Martyrs perished in London; and it was these terrible scenes that most deeply and immediately impressed the English people and made the mass of them profoundly hostile to the Roman Catholic religion. It has been said that the people of England have never got the smoke of the fires of Smithfield out of their nostrils. But the great tragedy of the reign, and that which has most affected posterity was the burning of the three bishops at Oxford.

From the time that Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer were condemned as heretics by Weston the prolocutor at Oxford, they remained in daily expectation of sharing the fate of the rest of the condemned. But apparently there were difficulties, if there were no compunctions, in the way. One reason given was the fact that at the first trial the country was not yet reconciled to Rome. It is also said that Gardiner had not abandoned the hope of succeeding to Canterbury, and put off the degradation of Cranmer, which would leave the see still open; but this seems of the nature of a guess. It is possible that even

Mary and Philip shrank from bringing an Archbishop of Canterbury to the stake. However this may be, it was eighteen months after the disputation before any further action was taken, and all this time the bishops remained in their Oxford prison.

At last, on September 7, Cranmer was cited to appear before the Pope, at Rome, within eighty days; and at the same time informed that his Holiness had appointed Brookes, Bishop of Gloucester, to try the case. Along with Brookes, as Subdelegate of the Pope, came Martin and Story as royal commissioners, and summoned Cranmer to appear before them in the University Church. The Archbishop was brought to the Church on the 12th of September, doing reverence to the royal commissioners, but refusing to recognize the representative of the Pope. He denied the jurisdiction of the Court and defended himself under protest. Brookes made a long speech, setting forth Cranmer's incontinence in having married contrary to the law of the Church, his heresy in regard to the Eucharist, his rebellion against the Holy See generally, and in particular his having consecrated bishops who had not been previously confirmed by the Pope. He was also charged with having given to the King the title of Supreme Head of the Church.

Cranmer prefaced his defence with the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed. He then declared that he held to the royal supremacy, so that he could not accept that of the Pope, charging the bishops of Rome with not only encroaching upon the rights of princes, but making laws contrary to the law of God. As examples, he men-

tioned the worship of God in an unknown tongue, the withholding of the cup from the people, the pretensions to dispose of crowns; all which showed that, instead of being Vicars of Christ, they were Anti-Christ. He reminded the President, that he had himself sworn to the Royal Supremacy. Brookes reported that it was to Henry VIII. and at the instigation of Cranmer; but Cranmer replied that it was done in the time of Warham, his predecessor; and that the doctrine had received the approval of the universities, Brookes being then a doctor signing with the rest. He was, therefore, in no way responsible for what had been done before his time.

Martin, then, took part in the proceedings, alleging the various inconsistencies of Cranmer. He reminded him of his oath to the Pope which did not prevent his submission to Henry VIII. and charged him with perjury as the price to be paid for his Archbishopric. He also reminded him of having condemned men for heresy in denying Transubstantiation, which he now denied himself. The Archbishop declared how reluctantly he had come into his high office, stating that, after the offer of it, he had remained in Germany for seven weeks, hoping that the King might forget him or change his mind. He explained, in a manner which has never quite satisfied his defenders, the sense in which he took the oath to the Pope, when he received the pallium from Rome; and he said he had been guilty of no inconsistency in connection with the Eucharist; for he had held the Corporal presence when he condemned Lambert, and until the time when Ridley convinced

him of his error. They further objected to his marriage, and keeping his wife secretly in King Henry's time, and openly in the time of King Edward. He confessed and justified his marriage as a bishop, and retorted that this was better than lying with other men's wives as some priests did.

The controversy went on with repetition of the same charges and arguments on both sides. Witnesses were examined with reference to the statements made by Cranmer in the discussion before Weston in the Schools. In answer to the charge that he had advised the King to adopt the title of Supreme Head of the Church, he said that by this he intended simply to declare that the King was over all persons and causes supreme, whether civil or ecclesiastical. As Cranmer could be sentenced only by the Pope, he was, at the end of the trial, conveyed back to his prison, until the decision of the Roman see should arrive.

The trial of Latimer and Ridley took place soon afterwards. As they were merely bishops, they were tried by a commission from the legate, consisting of Bishops White of Lincoln, Brookes of Gloucester, and Holyman of Bristol. The trial was held in the Divinity School at Oxford, September 30, 1555. When Ridley heard that the Court was held by commission from the Pope's legate, he put on his cap, so as not to seem to show respect to an authority which he did not recognize. By this he explained that he meant no disrespect for the Cardinal personally, as a man descended from the royal family and endued with much learning and virtue; but as legate he

could not recognize him. Consequently one of the beadles had to remove his cap. Bishop White then made an appeal to him to recognize the supremacy of the see of Peter upon which Christ had built his Church, the preëminence of which had also been recognized by the Fathers. Ridley acknowledged that the bishops of Rome had been held in high esteem on account both of the greatness of the city and the excellence of the occupants of the see; but they had been recognized only as patriarchs of the West. Other questions were raised such as had been discussed before, on the Eucharist and other subjects. Ridley, while giving the same answers, guarded himself against acknowledging the authority of his judges.

Latimer was required to go through a similar process. He was entreated to abandon his errors, and return to the Unity of the Catholic Church. This appeal roused him from his seeming indifference. "My Lord," he answered to the Bishop of Lincoln, "I confess a Catholic Church, spread throughout the whole world, in which no man may err, without unity with which Church no man may be saved; but I know perfectly that this Church is in all the world, and hath not its foundation in Rome only, as you say." He was offered a night to reconsider his reply; but he asked to be troubled no more on such subjects. They were then sent back to prison for one night to consider whether they would recant or not. As they still adhered to the answers they had given, they were declared to be obstinate heretics, ordered to be degraded and to be handed over to the civil power (October 1, 1555). It is well to remem-

ber the grounds on which this condemnation was pronounced. They were threefold: First, that they had denied that the true and natural Body and Blood of Christ were present in the Eucharist; Secondly, That they had affirmed the substance of bread and wine to remain after consecration; Thirdly, That they had denied the Mass to be a Sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Attempts were still made to induce Ridley to recant and accept the mercy offered to him; but he told them it was useless to continue such talk. He had no doubt about his doctrine, he would maintain it "as long as his tongue could wag," and, if necessary, he would seal it with his blood. At the same time he desired the friendly offices of the Bishop of Gloucester on behalf of his sister and her husband who had been turned out of his poor benefice in the diocese of London by Bonner. The Bishop promised to do what he could. The ceremony of degradation took place on the 15th of October.

On the evening of that day, we are told, Ridley was very joyful, and invited his hosts, the Mayor of Oxford and his wife, to be at his wedding next day; and when the Mayor's wife wept, he told her that, although his breakfast might be sharp, he was sure that his supper would be sweet. Next morning the two bishops were led forth to the place of execution, close to Balliol College, near the spot where the Martyr's Memorial, raised to their memory, now stands. One disappointment awaited them. As they passed the prison in which Cranmer was confined, they looked up in hope of seeing him. At

that moment, however, he was engaged in discussion with a friar; but afterwards he saw that they had passed, and knelt down and prayed that God would strengthen them for the trial before them.

When the two bishops came to the stake, they embraced each other, kissed the stake, and offered earnest prayer, Ridley saying to Latimer: "Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or enable us to abide it." The sermon, usual on these occasions, was preached by Dr. Smith, a Vicar of Bray of the period, who had always accepted the current faith and rejected it when it was out of fashion. He took for his text the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 3): "Though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." The sermon happily lasted only a quarter of an hour; but in that time the preacher contrived to insult the Martyrs to the utmost, comparing their death for heresy to the hanging of himself by Judas.

Ridley seemed inclined to make answer to the preacher; but he was told by the Vice-Chancellor that he could not be allowed to speak, unless he meant to recant. He answered that he could never deny his Lord; and that he committed himself to God, whose will would be done. Then their garments were taken off, and the fagots lighted, when Latimer uttered, to his brother sufferer, those words so often repeated and never to be forgotten: "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley, and play the man; for we shall this day light such a candle in England, as I trust, by God's grace, shall never be put out." He died almost immediately and apparently with

little pain, the gunpowder which had been hung about him having ignited at once. It was different with Ridley. The fagots of wood had been piled closely round him, in order to hasten his burning; but the pressure prevented them from catching fire; so that his feet and legs were consumed before the vitals were touched; and he was heard to say that he could not burn. One of the bystanders, however, threw down the pile of fagots, so that the flame leaped up and ignited the bag of gunpowder which had been attached to his neck and thus ended his sufferings.

Ridley was the youngest and the most scholarly of the three martyrs. He was only about fifty-five years old at the time of his death. He had come gradually to the opinions which he professed; but there is no sign of insincerity or of wavering in his latter days. His influence over King Edward was altogether for good. He largely determined the theological views of Cranmer; and his death was the death of a martyr and hero. Latimer, so often spoken of as "old," must have seemed more aged than he was; for at his death he was only about sixty-five years of age. He, like the others, had come by degrees to the reception of the doctrines of the Reformation; and he had resigned his bishopric after the passing of the Six Articles. Declining to be reinstated under Edward VI. he had been a great power in England as a preacher. His alleged coarseness did not interfere with his acceptableness to the people at large; and his sincerity and courage were unquestionable. At the beginning of Mary's reign

he might have escaped to the continent; but declined to do so. The work of the 16th of October, 1555, was about the worst that Mary and Rome could have done. A more august victim remained; but the martyrdom of Latimer and Ridley will always awaken bitter memories and reflections in the minds of Englishmen.

Two events of importance belong to this period, the meeting of a new Parliament, October 21, and the death of Gardiner on November 12, 1555. Gardiner, who was Lord Chancellor, was able to be present on the day of opening, when he spoke in favor of a measure of restitution of Church property, proposed by the Queen. He was in bad health at the time; and stories are told of his having suffered from his putting off his dinner hour on the day of the death of Ridley and Latimer until he should hear that they had actually been burned. As a matter of fact, he died about three weeks after his last appearance in the House of Lords, and his loss to the Queen was considerable. He is said to have died in a very religious frame of mind, saying, "I have erred with Peter; but have not wept with Peter," an expression which is quoted by his friends as an evidence of his piety, by his enemies as a proof of his impenitence. On the whole we must believe Gardiner to have been a man of ability, not more cruel than the average man of his age, ambitious but not specially greedy for money. If he fell in with the Queen's determination to persecute, he seems to have got sooner tired of burning than most of his contemporaries.

In the Parliament of October, 1555, as has been remarked, Gardiner had brought forward Queen Mary's proposal to restore to the Church all ecclesiastical property that had been vested in the Crown. After his death she sent for a deputation from each house, and explained her wish and her reasons. The Bill passed the Lords with only two dissentient voices; but was strongly opposed in the Commons, one hundred and ninety-three voting for it, and one hundred and twenty-six against it. By this Act tenths, first-fruits, rectories, impropriations, manors, glebe-lands, and tithes, to the amount of £60,000 a year, were restored to the Church and placed at the disposal of the Cardinal-legate for the augmentation of small benefices, the support of preachers, and the providing of exhibitions for scholars in the universities. It is probable that the opposition to the measure was the result of some apprehension that the other ecclesiastical property, which was now held by laymen, might be restored in like manner in spite of the pledges given when Pole came to England as papal legate. An assurance was given, however, that no such interference was intended.

In the Convocation of the same period Pole introduced a number of measures for the discipline of the Clergy and the reformation of the Church; apparently finding greater satisfaction in the improvement of the state and work of the Church than in the persecution of heretics. He did his best to put a stop to non-residence and pluralities. He counselled the bishops to be careful in their examination of candidates for confirmation, and to promote those who

were the most deserving ; and in this respect his own practice was an example to others. He also took in hand to set up seminaries in the different dioceses throughout the country.

Cranmer's case had been referred to the Pope, and after it had been heard by him, the Archbishop was excommunicated December 4, and by a Bull dated December 11, 1555, Pole was collated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Bishops Bonner of London and Thirlby of Ely were appointed papal delegates to carry out the degradation of Cranmer. To Thirlby the duty was a most painful one. He had been on terms of affectionate friendship with Cranmer, and had saved himself and his bishopric by recantation. Throughout the whole proceedings Thirlby showed the deepest sorrow, whilst Bonner is said to have behaved with great insolence.

On the 14th of February Cranmer appeared before the Commissioners who were seated on a platform raised in front of the high altar in Christ Church Cathedral. The commission was read, declaring that the case had been examined in Rome, and counsel heard on both sides; and finally investing the Commissioners with full authority to deprive, degrade, and excommunicate Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury; and, having done so, to deliver him over to the secular power.

In the yard adjoining the Church stood a table, covered with Episcopal robes, made of canvas, with which they clothed him, putting his pastoral staff in his hand. Perhaps the most disgraceful part of the proceedings was the heartless harangue of Bonner

jeering at Cranmer in his humiliation. "This is the man"—he went on—each sentence commencing with those words: "This is the man that ever despised the Pope's Holiness, and now is to be judged by him. This is the man who hath pulled down so many Churches, and now is come to be judged in a Church. This is the man that condemned the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, and now is come to be condemned before the Blessed Sacrament hanging over the altar. This is the man that, like Lucifer, sat in the place of Christ upon an altar, to judge others, and now is come before an altar to be judged himself."

It is always difficult to know how far an accused person should protest against a wrong done to him, or suffer in silence. Cranmer did not usually err on the side of contention or wrangling: his disposition was gentle and yielding. But on several occasions, during these proceedings, his indignation broke forth, and he gave something like the lie to his accusers. In regard to the charge of sitting upon an altar, he protested that he simply sat upon the platform prepared for him by Bonner and his officers; and whether there was an altar under it or not, he did not know or suspect.

Bonner was not likely to be conciliated by contradiction, and broke out more fiercely, when Bishop Thirlby was seen pulling at his sleeve to make him sit down; and it is said that afterward he rebuked Bonner for a breach of promise in reviling the prisoner. Even the spectators were scandalized at his unfeeling conduct, and vented their displeasure

in murmurs, so that Bonner at last seemed to be made to feel the indecency of his conduct.

It was useless to continue the conflict. Cranmer indeed protested that an archbishop could not be tried by two bishops, who could not have the right to remove the pall from the neck of the Metropolitan to whom they had sworn allegiance. The answer was very simple; they did not judge him as his suffragans; it was as the delegates of the Pope that they degraded him. Cranmer bid them proceed with their work: he would give them no trouble, he said, for with this gear he had long since done. When they had completed the divesting of the Archbishop by taking his cross from his hand, he drew from his sleeve a document in which he appealed from the judgment of the Pope to that of the next general Council, desiring that the appeal should be received. In reciting the judgment of Rome, the bishops had informed him that he was condemned *omni appellatione remota*; they could now only repeat what they had been instructed to say, and explain that it was impossible for them to receive the appeal. Against this decision Cranmer remonstrated; and Thirlby here fairly broke down, and received the appeal, in opposition to his instructions. He then went on to implore the Archbishop to reconsider the case. If he would recant, he promised that he would do his best to obtain a pardon for him from the King and Queen.

At this time Cranmer had evidently no thought of making any conditions for the saving of his life. He could not help being moved by Thirlby's appeal,

but he was strong in his convictions already so clearly expressed; and so the process went on. After being stripped of his vestments, he was required to kneel down before Bonner, and the hair round his head was clipped short. Then Bonner scraped the tips of his fingers in token that the sacred oil should no longer be found on them. He was then clothed in mean apparel and handed over to the secular arm. Again Bonner showed his coarseness and violence by telling Cranmer that he was no longer "My Lord" and by speaking of him as "this gentleman here."

Cranmer's appeal has been preserved. It sets forth, under six heads, that he had no intention of speaking anything against the Holy Catholic Church; and (1) that he had no power, being in prison, to send a proctor to Rome; (2) that he had no opportunity of procuring the aid of counsel; (3) that he disowned the papal authority, as not merely against his oath, but also as being contradictory to the English Constitution; and so forth. And then, turning to the other principal matter on which he had been condemned, the doctrine of the Sacrament, he protested that he had never meant to teach anything contrary to the Word of God, or the Holy Catholic Church of Christ; but simply that doctrine which had been set forth by the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church from the beginning. The real meaning of the accusation brought against him, he said, was that he did not allow the modern doctrine of the Sacrament, and because he would not consent to words unauthorized by Scrip-

ture and unknown to the ancient Fathers, but newly brought in and invented by men, overthrowing the old and pure religion.

It was certainly Thirlby who first excited in the mind of Cranmer the thought, perhaps the hope, that his life might be saved, if he would make some concession to the dominant system. Ridley and Latimer had been offered their lives, if they would recant. Why not Cranmer? And Thirlby entreated him to consider the matter and promised to do his very best on his behalf. He had no warrant for this attempt. There is no reason whatever for supposing that the Queen ever had a thought of giving Cranmer his life. Philip was not with her at this time. The abdication not only of the Empire, but of the Kingdoms of Spain and the Netherlands, by his father, the Emperor Charles V., required the presence of Philip on the Continent, as he was about to succeed to the hereditary possessions of the Crown of Spain and the Duchy of Burgundy. But Mary and Philip were of one mind in the matter of the destruction of heretics. And the Queen had long nursed the resolve to punish the arch-heretic, Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. He had obtained his great position principally by supporting her father's resolve to put away her mother. He had defended Henry's claim to be Head of the Church, setting aside the pretensions of the papal see. He had been the ringleader in the Protestant reforms under her brother Edward. As a daughter, as a vehement adherent of the papal system, she was constrained to bring this evil doer to justice. The

delay arose from such causes as have been indicated, not from any thought of mercy on the part of the Queen.

At the same time it seems probable that Cranmer had hopes of his life being spared, and he wanted it to be spared. He was advanced in years, he had come to the age of sixty-seven, and he was older than his years. Sorrows of many kinds and a hard imprisonment of two years and a half had worn and wasted him; and although, at times, his youthful vigor and strength seemed to return to him, yet more and more he became irresolute and uncertain. Cranmer had never been a self-reliant man: he had been the servant of the imperious Henry in almost all things; at the utmost only protesting against what he disapproved, yet ultimately submitting. And indeed such submission was not merely an act of personal weakness, but the expression of a principle which he frequently set forth. Whether Cranmer was precisely an Erastian we will not attempt to determine; but he certainly held very high views of the royal prerogative; and it is quite likely that he was plied with this argument in his hour of weakness.

The history of Cranmer's last days is sad and humiliating. There is no justification for the brutal violence with which he has been assailed by men who could not possibly be subjected to the same temptations and trials; nor was Cranmer a man who deserved such treatment at the hands of his worst enemies. He was a man of eminent purity of life, of unfeigned piety, of great meekness and gentleness

towards those who opposed him ; and these qualities might have warded off the bitter words which have been spoken against him. But it is undeniable that he, like other men, had "the defects of his qualities ;" and his advanced years and his lengthy imprisonment had broken down the strength of his will.

When Thirlby took in hand to obtain Cranmer's recantation and save his life, he induced Bonner to take the view that the recantation of Cranmer would be better than his death. It was by slow degrees that they led the condemned man along the path of humiliation, beginning with the signing of comparatively innocent concessions and ending with declarations that Cranmer must have known to be untrue.

In his first submission he simply declared his willingness to "take the Pope to be the Chief head of this Church of England, as far as God's laws, and the laws and customs of this realm will permit," a form of words which might be defended. More was required ; and in his second submission, he declared that he submitted to "the Pope, Supreme head of the Church, and unto the King and Queen's Majesties, and unto all their laws and ordinances." Here, we see, he saves himself from the shame of acknowledging the Pope by sheltering himself under the authority of the Sovereign. In his third submission he expanded the same thought at greater length, but without any essential change of meaning. But, so far, he had not touched the question of the Eucharist. And therefore in his next submission, he was required to give satisfaction on that point ; and he did so in the following fashion. After declaring

that he believed "as the Catholic Church doth believe, and hath ever believed from the beginning;" he added, "as concerning the Sacraments of the Church, I believe unfeignedly in all points as the said Catholic Church doth and hath believed from the beginning of the Christian religion." We suppose that a casuist might defend the signing of a doctrine thus worded, on the ground that it did not, in the mind of the subscriber, represent any opinion which he did not hold. At the same time, there can be no question that it was intended to convey a false impression to others. It was intended to satisfy the Queen; and Cranmer's real opinion would not have satisfied her. It was, therefore, the act of a man who was trying to save his life at the expense of his conscience.

So great hope was now entertained of his being spared that he was actually removed from the prison to the Deanery of Christ Church, and treated with great kindness; and although still watched, he enjoyed a large amount of liberty. But it does not appear that they had any sanction from the Queen for this change of treatment. It has been already mentioned that Cranmer had rendered great services to Mary during her father's lifetime; and it does not appear that this narrow-minded and conscientious woman was specially hard or cruel; but she was a fanatic, and she hoped that, in return for her zeal, God would reward her with blessings that she sorely coveted—the love of her cold-hearted husband, whom she worshipped, and an heir who might cement the union between England and Spain.

It soon became known that Cranmer's submissions had not gone far enough. One might think he had humbled himself sufficiently; but he had gone so far that it became easy to go all the way that was demanded of him. Accordingly in his next submission he declared the Bishop of Rome to be "the highest Bishop and Pope, and Christ's vicar, unto whom all Christian people ought to be subject;" and in "the Sacrament of the Altar" he believed and worshipped "the very Body and Blood of Christ contained most truly under the forms of bread and wine;" and much besides, but that was enough. One more, the sixth recantation, contained an expansion of the fifth with a deeper self-humiliation and an expression of penitence. In this submission he confessed the great sins of which he had been guilty in being, like Saul, a persecutor of the Church. In the previous document he had given up all that was distinctive in his reformed teaching, the "heresies and errors of Luther and Zwingli," and had declared his belief not only in Transubstantiation, but in Purgatory, Prayers for the dead, and Invocation of Saints. In this last confession he specially lamented his offences "against King Henry VIII. and especially against Queen Catharine, his wife," and all the evils which had flowed from his being "cause and author of the divorce." On account of all these things he humbled himself before God and the Vicar of Christ and the King and Queen. There was no deeper fall possible.

The proceeding was discreditable to all concerned; to Cranmer of course; but still more, to those who

made him believe that by such submission he would save his life.

When Cranmer was required to read aloud his recantation at the place of execution, he was apparently under the impression that his being conveyed thither was a mere form, and that his life would be spared. It has been asserted that his thought of recanting his recantation came to him only when he saw that he must die. There is no evidence or likelihood of such a thing. If we must do justice to the Queen by admitting that she did not break faith with Cranmer, we must do equal justice to the sincerity and courage of the Archbishop in the last hours of his life. One of the Spanish doctors who had been the chief instrument in buoying him up with the hope of life, came to him on the 21st of March, to prepare him for death. At the same time a seventh document was given to him, completing his previous submissions, which he was expected to read at the stake. Roman Catholic historians believe that Cranmer was ready to adopt this document, if his life could have been saved. Such a theory is highly improbable. It is far more likely that he prepared his final confession and determined to recite it in public, even if it should deprive him of his last chance of life.

It was arranged that the sermon should be preached and Cranmer's final submission made in the University Church on the way from the prison to the stake which had been fixed on the spot on which Ridley and Latimer had suffered. Cranmer was placed by himself on a platform facing the pulpit

from which the sermon was preached by Dr. Cole, Provost of Eton. In this his crimes were set forth, and it was explained to the audience that, in his case, recantation could not save his life. The tears fell copiously from the old man's eyes during the sermon. When, however, the preacher called upon the congregation to remain, that they might be satisfied, from his own mouth, of the reality of his repentance, Cranmer collected all his energies and prepared to make such amends to God and man as might be still possible; and even his enemies will not deny that the closing scene of his life was full of dignity.

Taking off his cap and turning to the people, he besought their prayers on his behalf, that his sins might be forgiven, and specially one thing which grieved his conscience above all the rest of which he would speak to them hereafter. He then knelt down and, humbling himself before God, prayed most earnestly for the forgiveness of his sins, since he had "offended both heaven and earth more grievously than any tongue can express." After this he continued his address to the people, exhorting them not to set their hearts on the things of this world, to obey the King and Queen out of conscience to God, to live together in brotherly love, and to abound in almsdeeds according to their powers.

He then, in the most solemn manner, proceeded to declare his faith, as in the presence of eternity and of his own immortal weal or woe, when dissimulation would be folly and worse. Repeating the Apostles' Creed, he declared: "I believe every article of the Catholic Church and every word and

sentence taught by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, His Apostles, and Prophets in the New and Old Testaments." There was a pause, and then he went on: "And now I come to the great thing that so much troubleth my conscience, more than anything that ever I did or said in my whole life; and that is the setting abroad of writings contrary to the truth, which now here I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and written for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be; and that is, all such bills and papers which I have written or signed with my hand since my degradation; wherein I have written many things untrue. And for as much as my hand offended, writing contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished therefore; for may I come to the fire, it shall first be burned."

A great tumult broke out among the audience, some who had been cast down by his recantation weeping for joy; others expressing their anger and hatred at this unexpected manifestation with every term of reproach and contempt. Being reminded of what he had said in his recantation respecting the Sacrament, he replied: "For this very fault I am most sorry, but now is the time to strip off all disguise. I say, therefore, that I believe concerning the Sacrament as I taught in my book against the late Bishop of Winchester." Being asked to remember himself and play the Christian man, he answered: "I do so, for now I speak the truth."

The angry mob pulled him down from the platform; but the soldiers protected him and led him

forth to the stake. Cranmer's heart was now at peace. He had sought forgiveness of God, and set himself right with his fellow-men. It is said that he came out of the Church with a smiling countenance.

“He passed out smiling, and he walked upright.
His eye was like a soldier's whom the general,
He looks to and he leans on as his God,
Hath rated for some backwardness and bidden him
Charge one against a thousand, and the man
Hurls his soiled life against the pikes and dies.”¹

As he passed along, accompanied by two Spanish friars who upbraided him for his apostasy and sought to draw him into discussion, he could also hear many words of loving sympathy and mark many a face bathed in tears of compassion. After some moments spent in prayer he was bound by an iron chain to the stake; and many pressed around him to grasp his hand for the last time. When the fire was kindled, he stretched forth his right hand over the flame before it reached his body, saying aloud, “This hand hath offended.” He never moved it from the flame, save once or twice to wipe his brow, until it was burned away, the sufferer exclaiming, and it was the only cry of pain that came from him: “That unworthy hand!” His left hand pointed upwards, his body standing motionless and erect, as though insensible and unconscious, and his prayer ascending to heaven, ‘ Lord Jesus receive my spirit.”

It is needless further to discuss the virtues and failings of one who, if not a great man, yet was a

¹Tennyson: “Queen Mary.” Act iv. Scene 3.

man of a deeply Christian temper, and never was imperious or domineering in the day of his power, or vindictive to those who had done him wrong. Not the Anglican Communion alone, but the whole of the English-speaking Christian Church owes him a debt of gratitude for his work in the compilation of the English Prayer Book; and hardly less, if not indeed more, for the exquisite and perfect form which he impressed upon the English translation of the Latin Collects, and those original prayers of the same kind, constructed on this model. If any doubt of the greatness of this debt should remain on the mind of the reader, it will be removed by a comparison of the Collects in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, either with the Collects which are occasionally set forth by authority for special purposes in modern times, or with the translations of the same Collects which are given in Roman Catholic books of devotion for English readers.

Although English Protestantism will always look back with greater satisfaction upon the martyrdom of Ridley and Latimer than upon that of Cranmer, yet it was probably this more than anything else that made Roman Catholicism to be abhorred in England. But the burning did not cease, but rather was carried on with greater vigor, men and women being burned in batches, and no longer Clergy only, but many laymen also. "It was," says Burnet, "an unusual and an ungrateful thing to the English nation, that is apt to compassionate all in misery, to see four, five, six, seven, and once thirteen burning in one fire: and the sparing neither sex nor age, nor

blind nor lame, but making havoc of all equally, raised that horror in the whole nation, that there seems ever since that time such an abhorrence to that religion, to be derived down from father to son, that it is no wonder an aversion so deeply rooted, and raised upon such grounds, does, upon every new provocation or jealousy of returning to it, break out in most violent and convulsive symptoms"—a remark which received various illustrations long after the death of the writer.

About this time the unhappy divisions among Protestants received a fresh illustration in the English colony at Frankfort. At first they used the Prayer Book in their service; but afterwards thought it better to accommodate their manner of worship to the French and Swiss type. This was displeasing to those who reflected on the persecutions to which the English reformers were now being subjected in England. An order was then procured from the Senate that only the English forms should be used in the Church. This raised opposition on the part of some of those who disliked some parts of the English service; and John Knox not only took part in the controversy but got Calvin also to write against certain things in the book. Knox had, about the same time, written rather freely about the Emperor, and had received a hint from the Senate of Frankfort to depart, so he and his friends removed to Geneva. These disputes were very grievous in the eyes of the friends of the Reformation in England, to whom it seemed strange that men who had fled from persecution and had sacrificed so much for con-

science' sake should quarrel about matters which they themselves did not regard as touching essentials. It was a representation, on a small scale, of the troubles attending the subsequent history of the English Reformation.

Pole was consecrated the day after Cranmer's death; and at the beginning of next year he undertook a visitation of the Universities. When the Commissioners came to Cambridge, they put under interdict the churches of St. Mary's and St. Michael's, because Bucer and Fagius had been buried in them. They collected all the heretical books that could be found in the Colleges, examined into the services of the Chapels, and required an account of the expenditure of the funds, which, they found, could not always be given in a satisfactory manner. Then Bucer and Fagius were cited to appear, or any one in their place, who would undertake to defend them. After three citations, no response being made, they took evidence as to the heresies of the two reformers, condemned them as obstinate heretics, and ordered their bodies to be removed from the sacred ground and made over to the secular power. On February 6th, their bodies were taken up and tied to stakes, with a number of their books and other heretical publications, and all burned together.

A Commission was sent to Oxford also, where they paid visitations of the same kind to the Colleges, and burned up all the copies of the English Bible they could find, and other objectionable books. Peter Martyr was on the Continent; but his dead wife lay buried in one of the churches; and a process against

her was begun. As she was a foreigner and could speak no English, it was impossible to find witnesses by whose testimony they might convict her of heresy. In this case they appealed for counsel to the Cardinal, who decided that, as she had been a nun and had broken her vow by marrying, her body should be taken up and buried in a dunghill, the penalty adjudged to one dying excommunicated. This was carried out. But in the reign of Elizabeth care was taken to prevent a repetition of the outrage by mingling her remains with those of St. Frideswide, that both might share the same fate. This work of the Commissioners at the universities seems to us now somewhat childish.

The work of persecution was now pushed forward more vigorously. The magistrates being slack in the hunting of heretics, a commission was appointed (February 8, 1557) "to search after all heresies; the bringers in, the sellers, or readers of all heretical books; to examine and punish all misbehaviors, or negligences, in any Church or Chapel; and to try all priests who did not preach of the Sacrament of the Altar; all persons that did not hear Mass, or come to their parish Church to service; that would not go in procession, or did not take holy bread or holy water." All such persons, when found, were to be put into the hands of their Ordinaries, to be proceeded against according to the laws. They were also empowered to search the premises of suspected persons, and to summon witnesses and compel them to give evidence on oath. It was evidently intended now to make a clean sweep of the whole brood of heresies

and heretics; and a large list of victims is given to show the fruits of this new measure; but enough has been done in this way already.

About this time the Spaniards, aided by the English, were at war with the French, by which the Pope, Paul IV., who detested the Spaniards and feared them, was greatly incensed against the English, especially when he heard of the defeat of the French at St. Quentin. Cardinal Pole had never been a favorite at Rome. He was suspected, at one time, of a leaning in favor of the Reformation; and it is said that he went greatly against his natural bent and inclination in carrying out the persecuting designs of the Queen, in order that his orthodoxy might appear to be beyond question. The assistance given by the English to the Spanish against the French aroused the anger of the Pontiff against the Cardinal, and he determined to punish him. This he did by making a decree for the recalling of all the legates and nuncios in the King of Spain's dominions, of course including Pole. When the Pope was remonstrated with on account of the danger to the faith in England at such a time, he said he would refer the matter to the congregation of the Inquisition; and promised that no intimation should be made to Pole. Nothing more was done until September, when Pole was not only deprived of his legatine authority, but ordered to come to Rome to answer to the accusation of favoring heretics.

It was now that Mary, in spite of her fanaticism and devotion to Rome, showed that she had some-

thing of the spirit of her father. Pole did not go to Rome, knowing something of the dangers of such an expedition, and perhaps of the dark purposes of the Pontiff. Indeed it is uncertain whether he received official information of his recall; but he ceased to exercise his legatine authority. Peito, a Franciscan friar, confessor to the Queen, was called over from England to Rome by the Pope, made a Cardinal, and appointed legate. Bulls were then sent to the Queen embodying the legate's commissions and instructions. But Mary ordered that every messenger from foreign parts should be detained and searched, and following earlier precedents, she had the Bulls laid aside or destroyed without opening them. When Peito proceeded on his journey to England, the Queen sent him word not to come over, giving him to understand that, if he did so, she would bring him and all who should acknowledge his authority under the penalties of the Statute of *Præmunire*. Peito died in the following month of April without returning to England; and Mary refused to allow Pole to go to Rome, and he was soon afterwards reinstated in his legatine office.

And now the time of emancipation was drawing near. Mary was only about forty-three years of age, and she had reigned little more than five years; but they were terrible years to her subjects, and hardly less so to herself. She had failed in everything. Mary never had the English nature and the English sympathies of her father and her sister; yet in her own narrow Spanish nature she had a very strong conscientiousness, a feeling of duty to her people.

But she had so far failed to win their confidence and affection that they feared her and hated her. She adored her worthless husband, and would have done anything to secure his affections; but the failure to have an heir had snapped the slender tie that bound them together; and he had departed for the second time and never again to return. She had done what she thought her best to put down heresy and to prevent the spread of the spiritual malady by which the Church had been afflicted, and the only result was a deeper alienation from the holy see and the religion of Rome. In the last year but one of her life she had actually quarreled with the Pope and set his commands at defiance. The last blow was given by the loss of Calais. The name of it, she said, would be found written upon her heart, when she was dead.

The French Ambassador, Noailles, gives a sad picture of her last days: "She lived almost alone, employing all her time in tears, lamentations, and regrets, in writing to try to draw back her husband to her, and in fury against her subjects." And her sentiments toward those whom she ruled were reflected in their estimate of their Queen. "Among all her subjects there arose a great clamor because that she made so many persons to perish, the universal opinion being that these poor wretches, who are hurried away to divers punishments, are all of them innocent." She died November 17, 1558 in her forty-third year; and within a few hours she was followed by Cardinal Pole.

Of this Cardinal hardly any evil can be said ex-

cept that his lot fell on evil times, and it was impossible for him to give full expression to his gentleness, kind-heartedness, and other "excellent virtues." But little of the guilt of persecution can be laid at his door. As for the Queen, if we cannot agree with Roman Catholic historians in placing her among the best of queens, we must yet acknowledge the innocence, the purity, and the religious character of her life. She was a good scholar and a devout Catholic. Even her resentment at the bad treatment she had received in early days did not equal her zeal for the faith which she professed. Bitter as she was against heretics, she does not seem to have been other than kind and gentle to her friends; and if in her latter days she was somewhat soured and embittered, we may more easily understand this than blame it.

Before we turn the last page of this reign, something should be said of the life of one who is now about to assume the first place in shaping the destinies of the English people and the English Church, the Princess Elizabeth. Her life had been one of great difficulty during her sister's reign. From the beginning she was suspected as a heretic and as an intriguer for the throne. When she was brought into the Tower, several of Mary's adherents recommended that she should be put to death. She escaped this danger, but was closely watched while in the keeping of Sir Henry Bedingsfield, a devoted Roman Catholic. She conformed to the religion then established, and probably without doing violence to her convictions.

At one time she was so much alarmed as to her safety that she thought of taking refuge in France; but the French ambassador strongly advised her not to leave the country, as she might thereby forfeit her succession to the throne. Several attempts were made to induce her to marry; but her difficulties in this respect were great. She could not marry a Roman Catholic without proclaiming herself on that side; and she could not marry a Protestant without placing herself in opposition to the Queen, her sister. Her position was an exceedingly difficult one. Elizabeth was hardly a Protestant in the ordinary sense of the word; but the daughter of Anne Boleyn could not well submit herself to a religion which denied that her mother was married, and declared that she was illegitimate. Yet it were a precarious position to occupy, if she ventured to declare against the claims of Rome.

When, therefore, proposals of marriage came to her from the Son of the King of Denmark, and from the King of Sweden, she refused to receive the envoy of the latter, referring him to the Queen, whom she assured that she had never heard the King's name before, and never wished to hear it again. She said, she had refused several offers in the reign of King Edward, and she wished still to remain a single woman.

On the other side, Philibert, Duke of Savoy, was strongly recommended, as a suitor, by Philip, who hoped, in that way, still to secure the alliance of England. Mary consented to this proposal with great reluctance; and then withdrew her consent,

on the ground that marriage ought to be free, and that she could not conscientiously constrain her sister to marry a man whom she disliked.

In this manner the Princess passed her days during those five anxious years, professedly left at liberty, but in reality under surveillance wherever she went. Her allowance was said to be insufficient to maintain the dignity of the Queen's sister and heir. But Mary was herself forced to be careful and even parsimonious, being desirous of reducing the great debt of the crown. There was no love lost between them. Either the one or the other was illegitimate, even if the law which proclaimed them both to be such could not be sustained. Mary even thought of having Elizabeth declared, by Parliament, incapable of succeeding to the throne, thus annulling the arrangement of Henry VIII. But Philip saw that this would leave the place open to Mary Queen of Scots, and so to a French alliance, as the Scottish Queen was betrothed to the Dauphin, whom she married in the year of Mary's death. It was, therefore, arranged that Elizabeth should succeed in case of Mary's death before her, and from that time Mary treated her with greater kindness and consideration.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ELIZABETHAN REFORM.



SHORTLY after the death of Mary, Heath, Archbishop of York, who had succeeded Gardiner as Lord Chancellor, announced the event to the House of Lords; and, sending for the House of Commons, he told them that God had taken to His mercy their late Sovereign, the Lady Mary; which, he said, would have been even a greater loss to them, if they had not such a successor in the person of her royal sister, the Lady Elizabeth, of whose right and title none could make any question. It had been established by the statute of the thirty-fifth of Henry VIII.; and the two Houses had now only to discharge their duty by concurring in the proclamation of the new Queen. The announcement evoked loud and repeated cries of "God save Queen Elizabeth! long may she reign." She was immediately proclaimed, first in Westminster Hall, and then at Temple Bar.

Elizabeth was at Hatfield when a deputation arrived from the Council to acquaint her with her accession to the throne. Her conduct showed her appreciation of the difficulty of her position, but also the calm and resolute manner in which she had prepared to take the reins of government in her hands. She declared that she accepted the burden imposed

upon her by the will of God, and that she would call to her aid the counsels of wise and faithful advisers. First among those was Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh. Cecil was a man after Elizabeth's own heart. His relations to the previous reign had been similar to her own. He had conformed, but not with the best grace; and Elizabeth felt and knew that in him she should find a counsellor whom she could trust.

It has been said that the greatness of the reign of Elizabeth was the effect of the ability of the men whom she gathered around her; and there is a sense in which the statement may be accepted. But those who would, in this way alone, explain the greatness of the period, overlook the wisdom which made choice of such counsellors; and, that which is, if possible, a more serious oversight, that Elizabeth not only reigned, but ruled. She had her own views, her own plans, and although she sometimes relinquished them in favor of those recommended to her, she never abdicated her position of final appeal. Whilst Elizabeth, for a time, carefully concealed her intentions respecting the Church, she made it evident at once that she bore no malice towards those who, in obeying her sister, might have been unfriendly to herself. To Bonner alone, it would appear, she showed marked coldness, holding him responsible for much of the blood shed during the recent persecutions. She retained several of her sister's counsellors, all of whom professed to be Roman Catholics; but all the new members of the Council whom she appointed were of the reformed faith.

Her real confidence, however, was given to Cecil and his friends.

Soon after her coming to the throne, intelligence was sent to foreign courts of the death of Mary and the succession of Elizabeth. In the letters sent, her hereditary right was declared, but the assent of Parliament was also announced. In the letters to Philip and the Emperor an assurance was given of the Queen's intention to maintain the alliance between the House of Austria and the English crown. To the Lutheran rulers, it is said, an assurance of sympathy was sent, and a desire was expressed for the formation of a union among all the friends of the Reformation. As regards the Pope, it has been stated that Paul IV. declared that she had no right to the throne; yet, if she would submit, he would do for her all that was possible. Lingard declares that this story is a fiction, invented to throw upon the Pope the blame of the subsequent rupture between England and Rome. There can, however, be no doubt on another point. Philip had not given up the hope of uniting Spain and England, and presuming, perhaps, on some expressions of gratitude on the part of Elizabeth, on account of kindnesses shown to her during her sister's life, the King of Spain proposed marriage to her, assuring her that he should be able to procure a dispensation from Rome. The proposed marriage was as distasteful to the Queen as it would have been to her people.

The people were still in suspense in regard to the Queen's designs as to religion. She continued to assist at mass as she had done during the late reign,

and she permitted the use of the Roman ritual at Mary's funeral. At the same time, however, those imprisoned under the late government were restored to liberty; and the emigrants to the Continent were allowed to return; whilst Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, was forbidden to elevate the Host in the Queen's chapel. Notwithstanding, she allowed the Coronation to take place, with the old ritual, and received the Communion in one kind (January 12, 1559).

But now the work of reformation was to be taken in hand in earnest. Elizabeth had declared, at her accession, that she would do as her father had done. It was clear, therefore, that the papal supremacy was to be disowned. How much further she might be inclined to go was not so certain. A woman who retained the crucifix in her private chapel could hardly be prepared to go all lengths with the reformers in her brother's reign; and the quarrels of the ultra-Protestants on the Continent, together with their attitude and demands on their return to England, were little likely to incline her to favor them. On the other hand, to retain the Latin services would be equivalent to condemning the Reformation, and keeping before men's eyes a kind of argument for Roman unity.

A paper was drawn out, probably by Cecil, sketching the policy of the Elizabethan Reformers. An account of it is given by Camden, and the copy still in existence agrees with his description. This paper is of the greater importance that it forecasts the subsequent action of Elizabeth and her government.

After pointing out the dangers to which the Queen would be exposed from the Pope, foreign princes, and those who had been in authority under Queen Mary, the document went on to recommend peace with France and the cherishing of those who favored the Reformation. As for those who had borne rule in Mary's time, they must not be too soon trusted or employed, even if they professed to turn; but those who were known to be well affected to the Queen were to be sought out and encouraged. As the bishops were generally hated by the nation, it would be easy to bring them within the operation of the Statute of Præmunire; and they should not be released from its penalties until they had renounced the Pope and consented to the reforms. Some learned men should be appointed to revise the Service books of the Church, but in the meantime, they should not be allowed to innovate without authority. A commission consisting of Parker, Grindal, Cox, and others, was appointed to prepare a revision of the English Prayer Book as it had been left at the death of King Edward. In the meantime it was allowed to give the Communion in both kinds.

A proclamation was issued December 27, 1558, giving effect to these resolutions. In this the Queen "charges and commands all manner of her subjects" to use no other manner of service, but that which is already used in her Majesty's own Chapel, and the Lord's Prayer and the Creed in English, until consultation should be made by her Majesty and the three estates of the realm. This Parliament was appointed to meet on the 23d of January, 1559, the writs be-

ing sent out by Sir Nicholas Bacon, who had succeeded Heath as Lord Chancellor. At the opening of the Parliament he spoke in the same sense which we have found expressed in the designs of the Council. Nothing, he said, was to be done, which would in any way "breed or nourish any kind of idolatry or superstition;" yet, on the other hand, care should be taken that "by no licentious or loose handling, any manner of occasion be given to any contempt or irreverent behavior toward God and godly things, that no spice of irreligion might creep in or be conceived." It is certainly not too much to say that in these utterances we have the Keynote of the Anglican Reformation.

Parliament met on the appointed day, the 23d, but was prorogued until the 25th of January. It is hardly necessary to say that no reference had been made to Convocation; but this cannot be imputed as a fault to the Government, since the reforming Clergy had been practically extinguished, all of them having been deprived, and many of them put to death.

Before any important business was transacted, a deputation from the House of Commons was sent to the Queen, humbly praying her to enter into matrimony, so as to supply "heirs to her Majesty's royal virtues and dominions." This was a very difficult matter to debate. We have already referred to the obstacles in the way of Elizabeth's marriage; and she gave the Commons to understand that, deeply as she appreciated their affectionate interest, and resolute as she was to contract no marriage that should

not be for the welfare of her people, she must be allowed to consult her own discretion in this matter. She had been quite satisfied, so far, she said, with her single state. Honorable proposals had been made to her in her brother's reign, which she had not entertained. She could not tell what might happen in the future; but if she married, she would make such a choice as should be to the satisfaction and welfare of her people. If she did not, her people were to her as children, and God would provide a successor. For her part, she would be contented to have it inscribed upon her tomb: "Here lies a Queen who reigned so long, and died a virgin." If she could not comply at once with their request, she did at least give them thanks for their kindly thought.

Among the first acts of the new Parliament was the recognition of Elizabeth's title to the crown; but the principal business with which they were occupied was the settlement of religion. On the 15th of February a Bill was brought in for restoring the English Service; on the 21st for throwing off the supremacy of the Pope and transferring it to the crown.

On the 17th of March a Bill was brought in reviving the laws on religion of King Edward VI.; and on the 21st another, restoring to the Queen the nomination to bishoprics; but the method by letters patent was abandoned and the *Congé d'élire* was restored. All bishops and other ecclesiastical persons and all in any civil employment were required to swear that they acknowledged the Queen to be Supreme Governor in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within her dominions. At the same time, by the

Queen's own desire, the title of Supreme Head of the Church was abandoned, and that of Supreme Governor substituted. By way of giving effect to these ordinances it was enacted that any one refusing this oath, should forfeit any office he held in Church or State; and further that, if any should advocate the authority of any foreign power, they should forfeit all their goods and chattels; for their second offence should incur the penalties of *Præmunire*, and for a third, be held guilty of treason. In regard to heresy, nothing should be so judged but what was so declared in the Canonical Scriptures or by the first four general Councils.

Meanwhile Convocation was not idle. With great unanimity both Houses passed resolutions which were presented to the House of Lords, declaring their belief in Transubstantiation, the corporal presence, the sacrifice of the Mass, the supremacy and authority of the Pope, and the right of the Spirituality alone to determine the faith and regulate the worship of the Church. The bishops seized every opportunity of speaking and voting in favor of these propositions; and the Universities accepted the greater part of them. In order to do away with the impression that these resolutions represented the sense of the English Church, it was resolved to hold a conference for the discussion of these subjects, in Westminster Abbey; five bishops and three doctors appearing on the Roman side, and eight divines on the Anglican. Bacon, the Lord Keeper, was appointed president, and the debates in Parliament were suspended, that the members might be present at the discussion.

It was agreed that the discussion should be conducted in writing, the Bishops commencing and the reformers replying. The subjects to be debated were: 1. As to the proper language to be used in public service. 2. As to the power of particular Churches to change ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies. 3. Whether it can be proved from Scripture that there is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and dead in the Eucharist. The Roman advocates, seeing the disadvantage at which they were placed as giving the last word to their opponents, declared that they preferred an oral discussion to the reading of papers. The Lord Keeper reminded them that Archbishop Heath had accepted the terms prescribed. Upon this Dr. Cole partly read and partly spoke an argument against service in the common tongue; and Dr. Horne replied. The Roman advocates asked leave to answer Horne; but they were reminded that this was contrary to the agreement, and the other members of their party had been offered the privilege of speaking after Cole. They were told, however, that, if they would put their answer in writing it should be heard at another sitting. On this occasion the Lord Keeper insisted on the second point being gone into, when a protest was entered by the Romans. They agreed, however, to proceed to the second point on condition of being respondents. They were told that this was contrary to the agreement, when they declined to proceed. They could hardly be blamed for resisting such a one-sided arrangement. Bacon, however, refused to alter the form of proceeding and broke up the conference. The Bishops

of Winchester and Lincoln were sent to the Tower for their disobedience. Burnet says that the Bishops had said something of excommunicating the Queen and her Council, and that upon this they were both sent to the Tower.

The revision of the Prayer Book was now being proceeded with. Matthew Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, was a leading man in the commission; but being unable, through illness, to attend to the work, his place was taken by Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester. It was originally intended, and it was the Queen's desire, that the first Prayer Book should be adopted as the basis, and that as few alterations, in a Puritan direction, as were possible should be admitted. But it was thought better to conciliate the exiles who had come under Protestant influences on the Continent. The Queen's wishes were conveyed by Cecil to Guest; and it was suggested that the Crucifix should be retained, processions sanctioned, the cope ordered to be used in the celebration of the Eucharist, the presence of non-communicants allowed, prayers for the dead permitted, and kneeling at reception required. Guest replied that it would not be well to restore ceremonies already removed; and that, since images are condemned in Scripture, the Crucifix is condemned; that processions are unnecessary; that, since the surplice is sufficient in baptizing and other services, it might well be used at the Communion. Prayer for the dead, it was said, was not a primitive custom, and was of dangerous tendency; and it was

the ancient practice to dismiss non-communicants before the beginning of the Liturgy proper: kneeling and standing might be left indifferent.

The Prayer Book, thus prepared, was brought before Parliament, and is described in the Act of Uniformity as the "book authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of Edward VI. with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise." Such was the book presented to Parliament; but it is evident that alterations were afterwards made in it by the Queen in Council. Not only do we find, in the Elizabethan Prayer Book, the changes mentioned, as to the lessons, the omission of the allusion to the Bishop of Rome in the Litany, and the joining together of the two sentences used successively at the administration of Holy Communion, in the first and second books of Edward VI.; but besides these changes, it was ordered that the Morning and Evening Prayer was to be "used in the accustomed place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel," and not, as before, "in such place as the people may best hear." In the second rubric it had been ordered that the minister, "being an Archbishop or a bishop, shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only;" whilst in the Elizabethan rubric it is ordered that "the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the

Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book." It should be noted here that the words, in the Act of Uniformity thus referred to, run somewhat differently, as follows: "that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized, under the Great Seal of England, for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this realm." In the Litany, not only the phrase respecting the Bishop of Rome is omitted, but the suffrage for the Queen had these words added: "Strengthen in the true worshipping of Thee, in righteousness and holiness of life." The Prayers for the Queen and the Clergy were placed before the "Prayer of Chrysostom" in the Litany, the occasional prayers being removed from that position and placed after the Grace which is now introduced after the Prayer of St. Chrysostom. But perhaps the most important change was the omission of the "black rubric" at the end of the Communion Service, in which an explanation was given of the significance of kneeling at the reception of the Sacrament. The reason of such omission is plain enough. It was not intended as a condemnation of the doctrine contained in the rubric, for the Queen forbade the elevation of the host; but it was

the wish of Elizabeth and her counsellors to make the Church and its Services as comprehensive as possible, so that no one should have an excuse for rejecting the teaching or abstaining from the worship of the national Church.

The changes in the Ordinal were slight. The oath is styled "of the Queen's Sovereignty," instead of "The oath of the King's Supremacy," and instead of being directed against "the usurped power and authority of the Bishop of Rome," it is "against the power and authority of all foreign potentates."

The passing of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity was strenuously resisted by the bishops in the House of Lords on the ground that it was disapproved by the whole body of the Clergy. It did not matter to them that it was substantially a book which had been in general use only five years before. All the bishops and nine temporal peers voted against it, and it was carried by a majority of only three (April 28).

By the Act of Uniformity it was laid down that all who should absent themselves from church without cause should pay a fine of one shilling, which should be given to the poor. It gave the Queen power, in case of need, to "ordain and publish such further ceremonies and rites as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, the edifying of His church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and Sacraments." If these words were intended to give an opportunity for the heightening of the Ritual of the Church, as the Queen had it in her own chapel, and as she probably desired that it

should be in the Church at large, the state of men's minds did not allow of any action being taken. Partly the remembrance of the days of Mary and partly the notions brought back from the Continent made the people averse to Roman customs. All the facts known to us would lead to the belief that no ecclesiastical vestments were worn during this reign but the surplice and the cope. The new Prayer Book was ordered to be used on and after the Feast of St. John Baptist (June 24, 1559) ; but in many places it was used in the month of May.

In reversing the policy of Mary, it was natural that the measures she had passed for the restitution of Church property should be reconsidered, and several acts were passed annulling those of the previous reign. Some of these were readily assented to, others vigorously resisted. It was with difficulty that an act was passed, allowing the Queen, in case of the vacancy of a bishopric, to reserve to herself any lands belonging to the see, giving impropriate tithes in exchange. This was opposed in the House of Commons, because the evil effects of such an arrangement had been seen in the time of Edward VI., when under pretence of conveying endowments to the Crown, the courtiers had the lands divided among themselves. Another act restored to the Crown the first-fruits of benefices ; and by another the religious foundations of Mary were suppressed and the proceeds vested in the Crown.

It was now time to apply the new laws to the rulers of the Church. They had been allowed considerable liberty ; and probably the Queen deter-

mined to give a good deal of latitude to all who would obey the laws of the land. But now that the Act of Supremacy was passed, along with the Act of Uniformity, it was necessary to ascertain whether the bishops would conform and take the oath of supremacy. Already, as we have seen, two of them had found their way to the Tower. All of them, except Oglethorpe, had declined to take part in the Coronation, although the Latin service had been used. And now, of the bishops remaining all save one, Kitchin of Llandaff, refused to take the oath of supremacy and accordingly were deprived and placed under restraint. Their treatment was widely different from that which had been accorded to the reforming bishops under Mary. Heath, Turberville, and Poole were allowed to remain on their own estates. Tunstall, Thirlby, and Bonner resided with considerable freedom in the houses of some of the reformers. Bonner was sent to the Marshalsea, partly, it is said, to protect him from the rage of the people. He died there ten years afterwards, September 5, 1569. Of the other Clergy the greater number conformed. Fewer than two hundred were deprived in the whole of England.

The reformation of the Church throughout the Kingdom was now undertaken in earnest. Commissioners were sent to examine into the state of the parishes and see to the deprival of disloyal clergymen. Along with them preachers went to instruct and enlighten the people; and it is said they found many of them sunk in the most degrading superstitions. But beside this, a body of injunctions was

drawn up, probably by the compilers of the Prayer Book, which was circulated throughout the country (June, 1559). With regard to the first of these injunctions—concerning images—a considerable controversy arose, the Queen at first desiring that they should be retained as a means to stir up devotion. But the reforming divines represented to her the danger of encouraging a proceeding which was contrary to the law of God, and had been forbidden under King Edward. So the Queen while not ordering the images to be removed out of the Churches, declared that no virtue should be ascribed to them. The next was on Clerical Matrimony. “It was nowhere declared,” said the injunction, “neither in the Scriptures, nor by the primitive Church, that priests might not have wives.” Still, to avoid scandal, it was ordered “that no priest or deacon should marry without allowance from the Bishop of the diocese, and two justices of the peace, and the consent of the woman’s parents or friends.” As regards dress, the Clergy were required to use habits according to their degrees in the Universities. Directions were then given respecting Church ornaments and worship, as kneeling in prayer, and showing reverence at the name of Jesus. It was further explained that the Queen, in claiming the supremacy, did not assert any power or right of ministration, but simply of rule and government. As regards altars, she ordered that none should be taken down without the consent of the Curate and Church wardens; and “the holy table in every Church to be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood, and so to stand

saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time it shall be so placed in good sort within the Chancel as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants." Finally the Sacramental Bread was to be made round and plain without any figure on it, but broader and thicker than the cakes formerly used in public Masses.

In some respects the Commissioners went beyond the requirements of the injunctions. For example, they took down, broke, and burned images, crucifixes, and crosses. In some places they destroyed copes, which were legal garments, vestments, altar cloths, books, banners, and rood lofts. It would seem, however, that there were no serious excesses; and, if many were pained by the destruction of sacred objects, others certainly wished to carry the work still further. It should be mentioned that these Commissioners, nineteen in number, known as the Court of High Commission in Causes Ecclesiastical, lasted for eighty years, and the court was finally abolished by 16 Charles I. c. 11, on the ground of its unconstitutional character.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CONSECRATION OF PARKER.



HERE now remained for the Queen the serious work of completing the Anglican Episcopate. The man whom she determined to put at the head of the Church was Matthew Parker, a man signally adapted for the time in which he lived, and the work he had to perform. There was only one objection to Parker, namely that he was a married man, and had no intention of parting with his wife, as Cranmer had been forced to do. But the reasons for his appointment overweighed the objections. Parker was born in 1504, ordained in 1527; in 1533 became Chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and in 1537 to Henry VIII. In 1544 he became Master of Benet College, Cambridge; and in 1547 he married. Under Edward VI. he became Dean of Lincoln. During the reign of Mary he lived in retirement; and at her death Elizabeth thought of him as the fittest man for the great office to which she designed to raise him. He was, in many ways, a man after her own heart, thoroughly convinced as to the principles of the Reformation, yet having little sympathy with the lengths to which some extreme men were inclined to proceed, nor had he the least desire to fall back upon the mediæval usages which had been left be-

hind. He was a man of large learning, deepened and mellowed by the five years spent in retirement, and of broad and comprehensive views, although not without energy and resolution in administering the law of the Church.

It was not long before Parker was thought of for the vacant Archbishopric. So early as the 9th of December, 1558, Sir Nicholas Bacon wrote to him to come up to London; and this request was repeated more than once, as he seemed disinclined for high preferment, to which he judged that he was designed. His health, he said, was far from good, and he should prefer some quiet position in which he might be free from the cares of government. But the Queen had a great remembrance of his kindness to her as a girl, and he was held in high esteem by Bacon so that they would not accept his refusal, although it was more than half a year before he was brought to consent.

The *Congé d'élire* was issued on the 18th of July, 1559. On August 1st he was elected, and on September 9, an order for his consecration was given under the Great Seal.

It is necessary to give, in some detail, an account of Parker's consecration; and it is hardly possible to do so without assuming an attitude more or less polemical. Here the Anglican finds the root from which he draws his valid orders; whilst the Roman thinks he is able, by at least bringing into doubt the validity of Parker's consecration, to cast doubt upon the whole Anglican succession. The weak point in the Roman position would seem to be that their

controversialists have so often changed their mode of attack. If it is impossible to describe the occurrences of this period without prejudice or bias, an effort will at least be made to state the facts with clearness and accuracy.

Three bishops were named as consecrators of Parker, Tunstall, Bourne, and Poole; but they refused to act. Then a commission was issued to Kitchin, of Llandaff, Barlow, formerly of Bath and Wells, Scory, formerly of Chichester, Coverdale, late of Exeter, Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, late of Ossory, empowering them, or any four of them, to consecrate. Kitchin, although he had taken the oaths, declined to act. Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins consented. The election of Parker was confirmed at Bow Church in Cheapside, December 9, and on December 17 he was consecrated according to the ordinal in the Second Book of Edward VI. in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace. This consecration is not merely recorded, but minutely described, in the Lambeth Register, whilst a transcript of this portion of the Register is also preserved in Corpus Christi College, at Cambridge, and it is confirmed by incidental testimony.

In the first place it is denied by Roman Controversialists that this Consecration ever took place; and further that, if it did take place it was not valid. The first of these contentions is now generally abandoned, and the ground on which the second was maintained is now changed; so that we might leave nearly all the older history of this controversy un-

touched, were it not that there is always a danger of its being revived.

The first objection brought against Anglican orders was that of Harding, in his controversy with Jewell, who denied their validity on the ground that they had not been conferred in accordance with the Roman Ritual. Then came Stapleton, whose objection was, that they were invalid because England was separated from Rome. This would seem to raise the question of jurisdiction which, apparently, has been abandoned of late. Then it was said, there was no laying on of hands. Then came the Nag's Head fable, which hardly any respectable Roman Catholic will now so much as name.

The chief questions to be answered are these: 1. Was Parker consecrated at Lambeth? 2. Was he consecrated by those who had the power to consecrate? 3. Was the form used sufficient for the purpose? 4. Was he a fit candidate for Episcopal consecration?

According to the Nag's Head story, there was no consecration at all. Scory, one of the bishops named in the commission, went up to Parker and some of the other bishops, who were assembled at the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside, and, laying a Bible on their heads, told them to rise up bishops. The story hardly deserves examination, yet a few remarks may be offered upon it.

In the first place, it was never heard of for forty years after the time of the consecration of Parker. Further, the story is told on the alleged authority of Neale, who was chaplain to Bishop Bonner. But

although Bonner had a controversy with Horne of Winchester, as to the reality of his Episcopal character, this story, which Bonner must have known, if it had been true or even current in his days, was not once referred to by him. When it was made public, there was no one alive who professed to know anything about it. Morton, Bishop of Durham, had been given as an authority, but it was solemnly denied by Morton on his deathbed. The story is also inconsistent with known facts since it represents that at the same time other men besides Parker were in this way made bishops, whose confirmations are known to have taken place at a subsequent period. But perhaps we have already given to this absurd fable more attention than it deserves.

To return to the positive evidence of the consecration. In the Register and in the papers at Corpus Christi College it is set forth that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, and by Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, both of whom had been consecrated in accordance with the Roman ritual under Henry VIII., and by Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale, formerly of Exeter, who had been consecrated according to the ordinal of Edward VI. This consecration is declared to have taken place at Lambeth on Sunday the 17th of December, 1559, a date which accords perfectly with the known circumstances of the case. What is the answer to this evidence? It is alleged that the Register has been forged. On what grounds does this allegation rest? It is said that it was not published for fifty years after the alleged

consecration, as though it were usual to publish the contents of Registers, which are always open to inspection. Moreover it was actually referred to in 1572, during Parker's lifetime; and it was published as soon as the promulgation of the Nag's Head story rendered it necessary.

The Register has been carefully examined by the most experienced eyes, and there is no difference between the writing of this part and that which follows; so that, if this is a forgery, the same must be said of all the four hundred and eleven leaves of the first volume of the Register; and also that other Registers have been forged in order to correspond with this; and that the documents in Corpus Christi College are also forgeries, whereas these documents were quite unknown to Mason when he first published the Lambeth Record, which he was accused by Roman Catholics of having forged! Another corroborative proof is found in one of the Zurich letters, written to Peter Martyr within a month of the time, speaking of the consecration as having taken place at the time given. The same date is given in the Archbishop's own diary and in Machyn's diary. Moreover, the old Earl of Nottingham had been present, and declared when the Nag's Head story came out, that it was at Lambeth; and he described all the circumstances of the consecration.

We sum up in the language of the able and learned Roman Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard: "To this testimony of the Register what could the champions of the Nag's Head oppose? They had one resource—to deny its authenticity; to pronounce

it a forgery. But there was nothing to countenance such a supposition. The most experienced eye could not discover in the entry itself, or the form of the characters, or the color of the ink, the slightest vestige of imposture. Moreover, the style of the instrument, the form of the rite, and the costumes attributed to the prelates, were all in keeping, redolent of the theology taught in the schools of Strasburg and Geneva. Besides, if external confirmation were wanting there was the Archbishop's diary or journal, a parchment roll in which he had been accustomed to enter the principal events of his life, and in which, under the date of the 17th of December, 1559, is found—'Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuarien. Heu! heu! Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me!' Another confirmation, to which no objection can be reasonably opposed, occurs in the Zurich letters, in which we find Sampson informing Peter Martyr on the 6th of January, 1560, that Dr. Parker had been consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury during the preceding month."¹ Lingard's conclusions were assailed by some of his coreligionists during his lifetime, and defended by him. It is hardly too much to say that they are now almost universally adopted.

A second question, however, arises: Was Barlow, the consecrator of Parker, himself consecrated? It is said that there is no proof of this and that, consequently he could not convey to another what he did not himself possess. To this there are two answers given. In the first place, although Barlow presided

¹ Lingard: "Hist. of England," Vol. VI. Chap. i. Note DD.

at the consecration of Parker, he was not strictly the consecrating bishop, inasmuch as the words were pronounced, as the Record carefully states, by all the four. But there is no good reason for doubting Barlow's consecration. It is true that there is no existing record of this consecration, and it is urged that he was so indifferent on such subjects that he probably did not care to receive it. The absence of the record, however, is not surprising when it is remembered that Cranmer's Register was very carelessly kept, and that it consists of a number of separate documents bound together long after their dates. There were, in fact, several other bishops, of whose consecration there is no doubt, although no record of it has been preserved. The letters patent, which authorized the Confirmation of Barlow, commanded the Archbishop, with the assistance of other bishops, to consecrate him, or to give other bishops a commission to do so. If they neglected to do this within a given time, they forfeited their bishoprics. When, moreover, it is remembered that Barlow was appointed by Henry VIII., not a man who would allow his mandate to be disregarded; that, after being nominated to St. Asaph, he held three other bishoprics in succession; that he was formally acknowledged as a bishop, and took his seat both in Parliament and in Convocation; and that he joined in consecrating other bishops, it will need a very large amount of credulity to admit that he was all the time unconsecrated. Here, again, we cannot do better than listen to Lingard. "It was asked whether Barlow had been consecrated as well as translated,

for both parties agreed that an unconsecrated prelate could not confer consecration. Now, it happened most vexatiously that no record of his consecration was known to exist. Though searches were repeatedly made in every likely repository, no traces of it could be found, nor, I believe, has any allusion or reference to it been discovered to the present day in any ancient writer or document. Still, the absence of proof is no proof of non-consecration. No man has ever disputed the consecration of Gardiner of Winchester; yet he was made a bishop whilst on a mission abroad, and his consecration is involved in as much darkness as that of Barlow.¹ When, therefore, we find Barlow, during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with the other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the Episcopal body."

But, it is said by some Roman controversialists that the form of ordination was insufficient; and that the invalidity of the consecration was practically admitted by the passing of an act of Parlia-

¹ Some time ago Dr. Kitchin, Dean of Winchester, now of Durham, discovered the record of Gardiner's consecration.

ment, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to legalize the position of the new bishops. The latter objection involves a confusion of thought between the validity and the legality of a consecration. The state of the law was, at that time, very uncertain. Several acts had been passed and several had been repealed; and thus some older acts had been revived; so that it was hardly possible to proceed without irregularity. In order, therefore, to prevent vexatious litigation an act was passed declaring the ordinations to be "good, perfect, and lawful." There was no question of their validity; but this act set at rest the doubt of their legality. This objection is now seldom urged.

A more serious question refers to the form of ordination, which was used in the consecration of Parker. This has already been considered under the Ordinal of Edward VI. The same may be said of the contention that Parker had not been duly ordained a priest.¹

It is a strange objection that the words "Accipe Sanctum Spiritum," or their English equivalents were not used; for they actually were used, although they were unknown to the early pontificals. With regard to the remark that the words of consecration do not refer to the order intended to be conferred, the same is true of the Roman Ordinal, and of all the ancient ordinals of the Western Church, with

¹ As already mentioned, the non-delivery of the vessels is given, by the present Pope, as a reason for the invalidity of Anglican orders. This ceremony was unknown in the Church for eight or nine hundred years.

the exception of that of Exeter, which was probably never used.

It is noteworthy that the present Pope, Leo XIII., in his Bull "*Apostolicæ Curæ*," makes the whole question to turn upon the sufficiency of the Ordinal and the intention of the Church as expressed in the service. With respect to the former point, it must here, once more, be noted that the denial of the sufficiency of the Ordinal involves a major premiss which would not merely destroy the orders of the English Church, but would undermine the foundation of the whole English Reformation. When it is said that the English Church had no right to fall back on earlier forms of ordaining after these had been altered by the Catholic Church, this is a question which may properly be argued in connection with the principle of the Reformation. If it can be maintained that the Western Church could not possibly go wrong, then of course all who oppose its doctrines or secede from its communion are guilty of the sin of schism, and the question of orders need concern neither party. But a major premiss of this kind cannot be allowed to be brought in for the determination of the question before us.

On one point the utterance of the Bull "*Apostolicæ Curæ*" is of importance. Referring to the defect of intention "which is equally essential to the Sacrament," the Pope remarks: "The Church does not judge of the mind or intention, in so far as it is by its nature something internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally, she is bound to judge of it. When any one has seriously and regularly made use

of the matter and form required for effecting and conferring the Sacrament, he is considered by that very fact to have intended to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed." This is a valuable statement and brings out well the true meaning of intention. These two things are quite certain—that the Service in the Edwardine Ordinal is drawn up for the consecrating of bishops, an intention which is, throughout, unmistakable; and that the service thus prescribed was actually used at the consecration of Parker. Following therefore the definitions of Leo XIII., we conclude that there was no defect of intention in the Lambeth consecration of 1559.

Different views are taken of the importance of the episcopal order and succession; but these are theological questions, which we are not called here to discuss. As regards the question of the actual consecration of Parker and the sufficiency of the Ordinal, these are historical and archæological questions, and the evidence by which they are established seems to be full and complete.

Shortly afterwards Parker consecrated Grindal to be Bishop of London, Cox to Ely, Sandys to Worcester, and Merrick to Bangor. At the beginning of 1560, Young was consecrated to St. David's, Jewel to Salisbury, Davis to St. Asaph, and Guest to Rochester.

CHAPTER XIX.

QUEEN ELIZABETH AND ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

FEW men possess the gifts that would qualify them for the difficult post which was now occupied by Archbishop Parker; and even his remarkable endowments could not prevent the office which he held from being a difficult and an irksome one. In the attempt to organize a truly national Church, he was required to fuse into one elements which were widely diverse; and no man was more deeply conscious of the arduous nature of the task than Parker. He was himself what might be called an ideal Anglican, who held, steadfastly and on intelligent conviction, to the middle way between Romanism and Continental Protestantism. But there were not a great many who were like-minded with himself. There was a large element of the old leaven of Romanism not yet purged out; and the returning emigrants had brought back with them opinions and a spirit which were soon to be embodied in what was afterwards known as Puritanism. Cecil was cordially with him, and so was the Queen, yet with some caprices of her own which threatened to give trouble to the rulers of the Church.

In the first place, an attempt was made, by the nonjuring bishops, to obtain some recognition from the government; and the Emperor wrote to the Queen on their behalf, asking that they might have

certain churches in large towns assigned to them. Both the Queen and the Archbishop were quite firm on this point. Elizabeth answered that these bishops had subscribed to the royal supremacy in her father's time, and why should they not do so now? She wished to treat them with all consideration; but she could not offend the rest of her subjects by granting the Emperor's request; and there was no reason for it, since there was no new faith now propagated in England, but "that which was commanded by our Saviour, practised by the primitive Church, and unanimously approved by the Fathers of the best antiquity."

A remonstrance was addressed to Parker by Heath, the dispossessed Archbishop of York; but the answer put an end to the expectations which had been based on the Archbishop's known kindness and fairness. Parker told Heath and his friends that it was the fault of the popes that had caused the divisions; and that instead of the reformers yielding "no subjection to Christ and his Apostles," as the Roman party alleged, he goes on, "we yield more than the fathers of the Romish tribe do;" and as regarded the apostles, he said they received their writings "with exacter obedience than Romans do," never allowing the will of man to set the Scriptures aside. The nonjuring bishops however were treated with great kindness and consideration.

The relations of the Queen to the see of Rome must, in various respects, be pronounced to be uncertain. We have already referred to the alleged communications between Paul IV. and Elizabeth

There is a similar doubt as to the communications of his successor Pius IV. It is said that, on his accession (in 1559), he sent his apostolic benediction to Elizabeth, advising her to put away her present advisers, and follow his counsels, and he would receive her back to the true fold. The genuineness of this communication has been called in question. There seems to be no such doubt respecting another letter, in which his Holiness stated that, if the Queen would give in her submission to the holy see, he would sanction the use of the Book of Common Prayer, including the Communion Service and the Ordinal. Although, he said, there were things omitted from the book, yet it contained nothing contrary to the truth, and it comprehended all that was necessary for salvation. He would, therefore, authorize the use of the book, if the Queen would receive it on his authority. It is said that the Queen, in accordance with precedents, refused to receive the nuncio. Queen Elizabeth did not pretend to be a Protestant. She spoke of herself as one of the "Catholic potentates." But it was too late for any attempts at "peace with Rome." The Roman see and the English crown were now finally separated; and the only attempt to reunite them that has ever been made since then, cost the English sovereign who made the attempt his crown.

On the other hand, there were difficulties with some of the new bishops and with the returned exiles. The Queen had insisted upon the retention of certain habits which the advanced reformers objected to. Even Jewel had a repugnance to

them. He speaks of the vestments as the "habit of the stage." He said the advocates of these things "hoped to strike the eyes of the people with those ridiculous trifles. These are the relics of the Amorites." Men like Sampson went further. He and others were much distressed at the prohibition of preaching which remained for some time, and the retention of the crucifix and the lights in the Queen's chapel. Writing to Peter Martyr, he rejoices that the images have been removed out of the Church; but expresses his disapproval at the things done in the Queen's chapel. "Three bishops officiated at this altar; one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as subdeacon, all before this idol in the gold vestments of the papacy; and there was a sacrament without any sermon." In another letter he mentions copes, and these were probably the vestments worn on that occasion.

Apart from the difficulties arising from these extreme parties, or rather in connection with them, there was the Queen to take account of. Elizabeth, it has been said, was not a religious woman, but she had very distinct opinions on ecclesiastical matters, and a very strong resolve to give effect to them. As we have seen, she retained something like the Mass in her chapel; and she gave orders that the roods which had been taken away from the churches should be restored. Jewel declared, "it comes to this that either the crosses must be restored or our bishoprics relinquished."

The difficulties which the new Archbishop had to encounter were manifold. It was not only the

Queen's persistency and the incipient Puritanism of some of the bishops that he had to endure and conciliate as best he could: there was also a great anxiety with regard to the disposition of Church property, especially the estates and manors to which reference has already been made. In the exchanges which were effected the Church was generally a considerable loser, and in many cases there was not enough left to provide for the ministrations of the Church in the Parish churches. This was the more deplorable from the scarcity and inefficiency of the Clergy. Jewel states that "there is a great and alarming scarcity of preachers: our schools and universities are deserted." As a necessary consequence, men imperfectly educated were ordained; and benefices had to be united. The effect on the life of the Church was very serious.

The Queen took occasion from these and other matters, the neglected condition of the churches, and especially of the chancels, in many places, to express anew her feelings of antipathy to the marriage of the Clergy. She had already placed some restriction upon it; and now came near prohibiting it altogether. As it was, she extended the prohibition to the case of collegiate churches, forbidding the head or any of the members of such establishments to have "his wife or other woman to abide and dwell in the same, or to frequent or haunt any lodging within the same, on pain of degradation." Parker, who was tenderly attached to his wife, was bitterly pained and grieved by these proceedings. Indeed on one occasion the injury came still nearer to himself. After the Queen

had been sumptuously entertained by the Archbishop at Lambeth, she is said to have expressed her gratitude to Mrs. Parker in the following manner. On taking leave of her, she appeared to hesitate as to the proper manner of address. "Madam," she said at last, "I may not call you ; and Mistress I am loth to call you. I know not what to call you ; but yet I thank you for your good cheer."

Amid all the practical questions soliciting the attention of the Primate, he never forgot the importance of asserting before the whole Church the true and Catholic character of the Church of England. In this connection it may be well to mention at this point the important work done by Bishop Jewel, although his great "*Apologia*" was not published until 1562. We have more than once referred to the position of the Church of England as equally removed from Roman Catholicism and popular Protestantism, a position which has been somewhat unfairly termed the *Via Media*, since it was certainly not adopted as a compromise, but upon a distinct principle. That principle was the retention of everything scriptural and primitive, and the rejection of everything mediæval which was inconsistent with primitive Christianity or superstitious.

It would appear that Parker soon began to contemplate the publication of some manifesto which, on the one hand, he might make clear not only to Anglicans themselves, but to Romans and Protestants, that the Anglican Reformation was based upon principles which could be defended on the grounds of Scripture and Reason, and which could be ap-

plied to all the religious questions that might come up in controversy. On the other hand, he doubtless hoped that the clear enunciation of those principles might be a means of preventing the English Church from drifting away from its moorings.

Parker himself was well qualified for such an undertaking. He was a man of wide reading and considerable learning; and his largeness of view and evenness of temper, his freedom from all narrowness of conception and sympathy would certainly have produced something for which the Anglican Communion would have been properly grateful. But it may be that his lowly estimate of his own qualifications deterred him from the undertaking, whilst the crushing burden of his cares of government may have forbidden the application necessary for the purpose. The work was therefore assigned to Bishop Jewel.

This "Jewel of a Bishop," as Peter Martyr called him, was born in Devonshire in 1522, was educated at Oxford; and declared himself a reformer at the accession of Edward VI. In 1551 he was appointed to a benefice which he lost on the accession of Mary. He saved himself, however, from further persecution by making a kind of recantation; but almost immediately repented of this, and fled to the continent, living at Strassburg, Frankfort, and Zurich for four years. His powers of thought and speech had been recognized early at Oxford; and he returned to England at the accession of Elizabeth with a great reputation as a preacher, and with some leaning towards the Swiss type of Protestantism. He was much employed as an advocate on the re-

forming side, and took part in the disputation at Westminster.

The keynote of Jewel's principal work was struck in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, June 18, 1559, while he was still a presbyter. Jewel was, we have said, inclined to the Protestant side as opposed to the retention of images, vestments, and the like; but he had a clear conception of the historical continuity of the Church, and had no notion of the reformed Church being a new sect constructed in accordance with certain individual interpretations of the New Testament. In a second sermon at Paul's Cross, he repeated the statements of his first, maintaining the Catholic character of the English Church, and insisting that the characteristic difference between England and Rome was, that the former was primitive and the latter mediæval. "We are come," he said, in language repeated in the Apology, "as near as we possibly could to the Church of the Apostles, and the old Catholic bishops and fathers; and have directed according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the sacraments and the form of common prayer." He was recommended by Parker for the bishopric of Salisbury, and consecrated, January 21, 1560.

It was as a bishop that he next appeared at Paul's Cross, June 18, preaching on the doctrine of the Eucharist from I Corinthians xi. 23-25. In this sermon he referred to a charge that, on a previous occasion, he had uttered more than he was able to prove. Accordingly, he said, he would repeat as near as he could call them to mind the words he had then spoken: "If any

learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church" on any of the points in difference between themselves and the Roman Catholics, showing that these testimonies favored the Roman doctrine, then, he goes on, "as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence; and because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived."

The points selected by Jewel for discussion were very numerous; but it may suffice to note here some of the principal Roman tenets assailed by him. The period during which he challenged his adversaries to show that the assailed doctrines and practices prevailed was "the space of six hundred years after Christ." The principal of them were: Private masses; communion under one kind; public prayers in a strange tongue; the supremacy of the Roman bishop; Transubstantiation; the elevation and worshipping of the Host; the real, substantial, corporal, carnal, or natural presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament; the worshipping of images; any and all of these things, he said, he would subscribe to, if they could be proved to have been recognized within the period which he named by any old doctors or councils.

The Apology was written in Latin and published

in 1562. A translation was made into English by Lady Bacon, wife of the Lord Keeper and mother of the great Lord Bacon; and almost immediately translations were made into a number of foreign languages. The Apology received the sanction of the two archbishops and the Queen; and by her command it was chained to a lectern in every parish church, beside the Bible. Jewel's work came very near being published as an authoritative document of the Church of England, but this was averted. Nevertheless, its influence was deep and wide; and the Church of England owes much to its author's learning and moderation.

Several other works were now done in the way of completing the formularies of the Church. A Latin translation of the Prayer Book was made, principally from the first of Edward VI., apparently with the intention of giving to that book an authority coördinate with that of the Elizabethan revision. The old calendar, with the names of many saints, was now restored. In the first Prayer Book only red-letter days had been retained. In the second the names of St. George, St. Lawrence, and St. Clement were added. St. Clement was again omitted in the Calendar of 1559. The Latin Prayer Book had a great number of names. Finally the number in the Calendar was considerably reduced. Along with the Calendar there was published a new Lectionary, in which the lessons were made to correspond with the subject of the day.

The Parliament met on January 12, 1563. Convocation met January 19, when Dean Nowell of St.

Paul's was chosen Prolocutor. Among the first things undertaken by Convocation was the revision of the Articles, which may be conveniently considered by itself. It now became evident that the foreign or puritan party had gained a considerable accession of strength in Convocation, chiefly in the Lower House, although even among the bishops they had supporters. Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, proposed to forbid, by Act of Parliament, Lay Baptism and the use of the sign of the cross in that sacrament. He went so far as not only to move the re-appointment of the commissioners for drawing up reformed canons, but endeavored to obtain for them the power of making laws binding upon the Church. The Lower House at the same time petitioned the bishops on these points: 1. That only Sundays should be kept as holy days; 2. That the minister should read the service turning to the people; 3. That the sign of the cross in baptism should be discontinued; 4. That kneeling at the communion should be optional; 5. That the surplice should suffice at all ministrations; 6. That the use of organs should be prohibited. These resolutions were very nearly carried in the Lower House. It is, therefore, evident that the Puritan leaven was working powerfully in the Church—destined to be a cause of much anxiety to her rulers.

The first book of Homilies had been published in the first year of the reign of King Edward VI.; and now a second book was put forth with a preface by Bishop Cox, pointing out that this book was a kind of continuation of the earlier one published in King

Edward's time. These Homilies, like the earlier ones, were intended to be read from the pulpit, instead of sermons. It has been generally supposed that the Homilies were of a Puritan character; and it is true that they set forth the doctrine of justification by faith alone; which, however, when rightly understood, is by no means a doctrine peculiar to Puritanism. Yet, along with this, the Homilies recognize the Catholic principle of submission to early testimony, and especially to the first four councils; and they assign a sacramental character to ordinances which have not been stamped as Sacraments by Protestants. It is a small thing to say that the Homilies teach regeneration in baptism, since nearly all the Protestant and Reformed Confessions do the same; but they also speak of the Holy Eucharist in terms which some of the bodies represented by those confessions would by no means approve.

In close connection with the publication of the Homilies came the project of providing an authorized version of the English translation of the Scriptures. We have already referred to the work done by Tyndale, Coverdale, and Rogers; the last published under the name of Thomas Matthew (1537). From this Bible, which was a combination of the labors of Tyndale and Coverdale, all later revisions have been successively formed. "In that the general character and mould of our whole version was definitely fixed. The laborers of the next seventy-five years were devoted to improving it in detail."¹

¹ Westcott: "History of the English Bible," p. 73.

The next revision, the Great Bible, was brought out under the supervision of Coverdale, and was published in 1540. This was the Bible copies of which were placed in all the parish churches, six of them being set up "in certain convenient places of St. Paul's Church."

During the reign of Queen Mary the reading of the Bible was discouraged, and no English Bible was printed. Rogers and Cranmer suffered martyrdom, and Coverdale with difficulty escaped to the continent. Copies of the Scriptures that had been set up in the Churches were burnt. But the exiles were doing something towards making the Bible known: at the close of Mary's reign the Genevan version of the New Testament was printed—"a work destined to influence very powerfully our authorized version." The German New Testament was published in 1557; but three years afterwards the whole Bible was brought out, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth (1560); and soon became the most popular version of the Scriptures among English readers. Nor was this appreciation of the work unjustified, for the revisers had honestly done their best to represent in English the meaning of the original.

When Queen Elizabeth ordered the Bible to be set up in all the Churches, the Great Bible was what we might call the authorized version; but the Genevan version made people acquainted with its defects; and Parker took measures for the revision of the older version. The same method was adopted as with the revision made under King James. The whole Bible was divided into "parcels," which were

distributed among learned men, who, after examination, sent them back with their comments to the Archbishop, who was to put the last touch to them and have them printed and published.

Among those who assisted were Bishop Sandys of Worcester, Bishop Guest of Rochester, and Bishop Cox of Ely; and at last, in 1568, the "Bishops' Bible" appeared in a magnificent volume, without any dedication; but the preface expresses the sense of the translators, that, while they had done their best, there was much yet to be accomplished. It is not completely known who were the revisers; although it is certain that eight of them were bishops, and from them the book received its title of the "Bishops' Bible." The use of it was sanctioned by Convocation in 1571.

Another provision of Convocation for the instruction of the people was the drawing up of a longer Catechism. This was done by Dean Nowell on the basis of a Catechism written by Poyntet, Bishop of Winchester, which had been approved by Convocation in the time of Edward VI. This Catechism was a meritorious composition, and is still worthy of study as illustrating the theological thought of the period; but it was composed under Calvinistic influence, and Parker saw that it would be of serious effect to give it the approval of the Church; and so he prevented its being sanctioned by the upper house of Convocation. It was ultimately published in 1570 with a dedication to the Archbishop, for which the Church was not, in any way, responsible. Those who would regard the adoption of the Geneva

Bible and Nowell's Catechism as an infringement on the Catholic principles of the English Church, will do well to remember how much they owe to the moderation, comprehension, and firmness of Archbishop Parker.

A second Act of Supremacy, of a more severe character than the earlier one, was passed by this Parliament, requiring the oath to be taken by several classes not mentioned in the previous act; particularly those who should condemn the ceremonies of the Church or assist at the celebration of any private mass. Such persons, if they refused the oath a second time, were to be held guilty of treason, and were liable to be put to death. One instance of the application of the Act was the tendering of the oath to Bonner, by Howe, Bishop of Winchester. Bonner raised the question of the legality of Howe's consecration, which led to the passing of the Act mentioned in the chapter on the Consecration of Parker.

CHAPTER XX.

THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION.



THE Articles, now thirty-nine, originally forty-two, or even forty-five in number, constitute an important part of the Anglican Reformation; and have been differently viewed by different schools. The saying that the Church of England had a Popish Liturgy, a Calvinistic Creed, and an Arminian Clergy had just that superficial semblance of truth which helped to conceal its falsity. For the reformed services are not, and never have been, Popish. The Articles are not Calvinistic, a fact proved by the subsequent attempt to make them so; and the Clergy have never, as a class, been Arminian, except in their opposition to Calvinism.

There can be no doubt, however, the Articles do represent, and were intended to represent, the Protestant side of the English Church, although certainly not to the negation or ignoring of the Catholic side. They were also intended to protest not merely against mediæval corruptions of the primitive faith; but also to warn against the manifold errors which came in the wake of the newly-asserted liberty of thought. For these reasons they have always been the favorite document of the Protestant and Puritan members of the Church, whilst they were never liked by the reactionary school, and were regarded

with something of aversion and apprehension by the Latitudinarians. The latter made an attempt to show that they were mere "articles of peace;" whilst the former qualified them as susceptible of a non-natural sense.

If by "articles of peace" it is meant that men might hold what opinions they pleased, so long as they did not openly contradict any of the Articles, it is enough to say that no honest man could attach his name to the document in that sense. On the other hand, it is quite certain that, as formularies of this kind grow old, and words gain new meanings, it is of necessity that some liberty of interpretation should be allowed to subscribers; and this has been done. As regards the other plea, that the Articles may be taken in a non-natural sense, it is superfluous to remark that the phrase is not happily chosen, and its obvious meaning is indefensible. At the same time, it was certainly intended that the Articles, like the services, should comprehend different schools of thought; and indeed it was hoped, by a wise comprehensiveness, to include the whole people in the one Church. Yet this was not to be done by obliterating all doctrinal outlines. The Articles were intended to declare the Catholicity of the English Church, as well as its independence and liberties; and also to clear it from all complicity with those errors of doctrine and faults of practice which had been sanctioned by some of the new Protestant sects.

It has been well remarked that the true criticism of a doctrine is its history; and if we really wish to

understand the meaning of the Articles, and do not rather want to defend the meaning which we may have foisted into them, we shall best succeed by a careful study of their history, which, however, can here be given only in outline.¹

Some account has already been given of the doctrinal formularies which were drawn up before the reign of Edward VI. It is said that the death of Henry filled the enemies of the Reformation with joy; but the hopes which they cherished were speedily blighted. The so-called Reformation under Henry VIII. was a mere casting off of a tyranny, without removing the features of the mediæval system which the real reformers regarded as corruptions. This was done in the reign of Edward VI. by the removal of those features from the public services, and the drawing up of the Articles of Religion. The leader in both of these works was Archbishop Cranmer.

We have already touched upon the different phases in Cranmer's doctrinal convictions; and we need here only refer to one characteristic to which the Anglican communion owes an inestimable debt, namely, the conservative temper in which every department of his work was carried out. The contrast between Cranmer and Calvin in this respect has been well pointed out by Archbishop Lawrence: Calvin, he says, "chose rather to become an author than a compiler, preferring the task of compiling a new Liturgy to that of reforming an old one." Cranmer's conservatism is, of course, more obvious in the services

¹ The reader who wishes to go more deeply into the subject will naturally refer to Hardwick's "*History of the Articles.*"

than in the Articles ; but it is not absent from either ; and it is also conspicuous in the Homilies. There is no reason to doubt the solemn testimony, already noticed as given on the occasion of his martyrdom, that he had never meant to believe or teach anything contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, but simply to set forth that which had been held by "the most holy and learned Fathers and Martyrs of the Church."

It has been noticed that whilst the first Prayer Book appeared in 1549 and the second in 1552, the Articles were not published until 1553, the last year of King Edward. It has been thought that this delay arose from Cranmer's hope of obtaining some common Confession in which all the reformed Churches should join. For this purpose he entered into communication with the German and Swiss Reformers ; but it was soon discovered that no agreement could be got between these two schools on the subject of the Eucharist.

It is believed that a document was drawn up at least as early as 1549 which formed the basis of our present Articles ; and soon afterwards these Articles seem to have been used as a kind of test for preachers ; for Hooper writes, in the year named, that the Archbishop of Canterbury "has some Articles of Religion to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe ; or else a licence for teaching is not granted them."

It was not, however, until 1551 that the King and Council directed the Archbishop to "frame a book of Articles of Religion, for the preserving and main-

taining peace and unity of doctrine in this Church, that being finished they might be set forth by public authority." It cannot be certain whether Cranmer's early Articles were a first draft of the Forty-two; or a preliminary document of a similar character, although the former supposition is the more probable.

The document drawn up by Cranmer was submitted by him to the other bishops some time before its publication (1551), and in the spring of the following year a communication came from the Council to the Archbishop, asking whether the Articles which had been "delivered to the bishops" were "set forth by any public authority according to the minutes." They were thereupon forwarded to the Council, but soon after returned to the Archbishop, who subjected them to a fresh revision, supplying titles and some supplementary clauses. He then sent a copy of them to Sir William Cecil and Sir John Cheke, asking for their suggestions. The document was finally submitted to the King that he might authorize the bishops to apply it as a test to the clergy.

After this the Articles, then forty-five in number, were submitted to the scrutiny of six royal Chaplains, among them Horne, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, and Grindal, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. The title they bore at that time was "Articles concerning an uniformity in Religion." They were returned to Cranmer on the 20th of November, and returned by him to the Council on the 24th. It was not, however, until the 19th of June, 1553, that a mandate was issued in the name of the King, to the officials of the Province of Canterbury, requiring

them to see that the new Formulary was publicly subscribed. To some extent this order was obeyed, in two or three dioceses, during the few remaining days of Edward's life. The articles were, however, published in the month of May, 1553, under the title: "Articles agreed on by the Bishops and other learned men in the Synod of London, in the year of our Lord 1552 (i. e. 1553 n. s.), for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion." They were also published in Latin.

The question has been raised as to what determined the reformers in the selection of the subjects of the Articles. The question has been partly answered, but may receive some further consideration.

In the title given to the English edition of the Articles they are said to relate to "certain matters of religion;" and to aim at the "establishment of a godly concord and the avoiding of controversies." Two articles, the eighth (now ninth) and thirty-seventh (now thirty-eighth) condemn errors on Original Sin and the community of goods, then held by the Anabaptists. Four others, the last four which have now disappeared, are directed against errors respecting the future state of men—namely, the thirty-ninth, asserting that the resurrection of the dead is not already past; the fortieth, that the souls of the departed do not perish with their bodies nor sleep until the day of judgment; the forty-first against Millenarians; and the forty-second, declaring that all men shall not be saved at the last. The twelfth and thirteenth (now thirteenth and fourteenth) condemn

the doctrine of the schoolmen on merit and works of supererogation. The twenty-third (now twenty-second) Article "of Purgatory" condemned the "Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints." It is apparent, therefore, that these Articles were directed equally against the errors of Rome and those of the self-willed sectaries who would put no bridle upon their own imaginations and tastes.

The Anabaptists, with their many heresies, were a sore trouble to the reformers in Germany and in England, and some of the Swiss reformers, with their theories of the sacraments, seemed to rob them of all virtue and almost to deny their necessity, so that the Anglicans were bound to protest that the sacraments were not only "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession but rather they be certain, sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace."

The first four Articles assert the Catholic faith as it was established by the great councils and set forth in the Creeds, the first two being taken almost entirely from the Augsburg Confession. The fourth was directed against a certain semi-docetic class of Anabaptists or Mennonites who denied that Christ had taken true human nature. In regard to the eighth (now ninth) article "of original or birth sin," it was certainly directed against the Pelagians; but it looks as though it were also aimed at the Roman doctrine, that Concupiscence had *not* the nature of sin. It is hardly too much to say that this is a mere question of definition.

It will be easy for the reader to follow up the references in the various Articles; and it may be now useful to notice by what authority the whole collection was promulgated, not a very easy question to answer. Were the Articles submitted to Convocation, or were they promulgated by the mere authority of the King and his Council? The latter is assumed to be the truth because no record remains of the approval of Convocation, and because the Articles are said to have been agreed on "by the bishops and other learned men at the Synod in London." As, however, no objection seems to have been urged against the Articles on the ground that they lacked synodal approbation, it seems probable that this had been given; and it was positively and publicly asserted, on their revival in the Convocation of 1563, that they had possessed such authority.¹ These Articles do not seem ever to have been formally abolished under Queen Mary: they simply were tacitly suppressed.

We have seen how cautiously Queen Elizabeth went to work on her accession to the throne, silencing the pulpits, putting a stop to the abusive epithets of papist on the one side and heretic on the other, forbidding superstitious worship and also indifference and contempt of holy things. We have seen also how she found in Matthew Parker a man eminently qualified to carry on the work of Thomas Cranmer. His testimony is the very echo of the

¹The reader is referred to Hardwick for the various reasons which induced him to believe that the Articles had synodal approval.

words of his martyred predecessor. "We of the Church of England," he said, "reformed by our late King Edward and his clergy, and now by Her Majesty and hers reviving the same, have but imitated and followed the example of the ancient and worthy fathers."

It is remarkable that the Articles, apparently sanctioned by Convocation and never repealed, seem not to have been referred to under Elizabeth until they were brought up for discussion in the Convocation of 1563. Even after they had been modified in that Synod, subscription to them was not enforced until the Parliament and Convocation of 1571. In the meantime, however, another test of doctrine was provided for the bishops, namely the Eleven Articles of Religion, drawn up under the supervision of Parker and with the sanction of the Archbishop of York, to which the clergy were required to signify their adhesion on admission to a benefice, and also twice a year, immediately after the Gospel for the day. These Articles, as far as they went, resembled the Forty-two, but with the avoidance of some of the burning questions of the day.

A few words may properly be given to this Formulary, which, practically at least, for a time represented the authoritative teaching of the English Church. The first Article confessed the Trinity in Unity; the second, the sufficiency of Scripture; the third declares the Church to be the Spouse of Christ, and asserts that a national Church has the right to regulate its ritual. The fourth excludes from office, ecclesiastical or secular, all who have

not been lawfully called thereto by "the high authorities." The fifth sets forth the Royal Supremacy, whilst the sixth rejects that of the Pope. The seventh declares the English Prayer Book to be "agreeable to the Scriptures," also "Catholic, apostolic, and meet for the advancing of God's glory." The eighth declares for the abolition of unction, exorcism, etc., in the Sacrament of baptism, as not pertaining to the substance of the Sacrament. The ninth pronounces private Masses to have been unknown to the Fathers of the primitive Church. The tenth declares for communion in both kinds, and denounces the withholding of the "mystical cup" as "plain sacrilege." The eleventh condemns the worshipping of images and relics, and other superstitions. These eleven Articles served a useful purpose, and something of the kind was necessary until the greater document should be reinstated; and this was done by the Convocation of 1563, and the revised Articles were enjoined on the Clergy by the canons of the Convocation of 1571. To the Articles as then revised we have now to give attention.

In preparation for the Convocation which met in January, 1563, Parker had been subjecting the Forty-two Articles to a careful examination and revision, assisted by Cox of Ely, Guest of Rochester, and others of the bishops. Parker's manuscripts, given by him to his College, Corpus Christi, at Cambridge, enable us to follow the alterations which were made in the older articles. Some of Parker's colleagues would have preferred his accommodating the Articles more to the Swiss type,

and regarded the Lutherans as little better than "Papists in disguise." Yet it was to a Lutheran Confession, that of Würtemberg, little more than an echo of that of Augsburg, that Parker had chief recourse. Thus the fifth Article of the Thirty-nine, "Of the Holy Ghost," which had no place among the Forty-two, was taken from the Würtemberg confession. So was the appendix to the sixth respecting the books "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." And so of several portions of other articles.

But there were other changes made. The twenty-ninth and the thirtieth of our Articles—"of the wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," and "of both kinds"—have no place among the Forty-two. The same is true of Article twelve, "of good works;" and also of the twenty-ninth, directed against the theory that mere partaking of the Eucharist brought a blessing, and the twelfth against the rising antinomianism. Several of the other articles were modified. The thirty-seventh was new—"of the Civil Magistrates"—and explains the sense in which the Royal Supremacy is held: "We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word, or Sacraments but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal."

To the twenty-eighth article "Of the Lord's Supper" after "the plain words of Scripture," these

words are added: "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." Also the paragraph on the body of Christ, "being given, taken, and eaten after a heavenly and spiritual manner," was added, Guest being the author of it. Besides these changes and others already mentioned, the tenth of the Forty-two, "Of Grace," the sixteenth, on "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," and the nineteenth on the obligation of the Moral Commandments, were omitted, part of the last being incorporated in our seventh article "of the Old Testament." Reference has already been made to the dropping of the last four of the Forty-two, probably because the dangers from the Anabaptists had passed away. A remarkable omission from the article on the Sacraments (now the twenty-fifth), was the phrase "*ex opere operato*," which seems to have been dropped in consequence of explanations given. On the whole, the changes made in these articles were on the side of toleration and liberality. They were signed readily by a good many members of Convocation; but others hesitated. By degrees, however, nearly all seem to have fallen in (February, 1563). The Articles were then printed at the royal press. In this printed copy the twenty-ninth article is lacking; but it was taken in again by the bishops in 1571, and it is found in all the printed copies after that date. The first sentence of article twenty on the authority of the Church in controversies of faith, is found in the edition authorized by the Queen, but not in some other copies; but there seems no doubt it was in the copy signed by Convocation in 1563, and it was finally ratified in 1571.

It has been mentioned that the Articles were finally sanctioned and imposed after the Convocation of 1571. In this same Convocation a book of canons was drawn up and introduced into the Upper House. It never was laid before the Lower House; yet the canons were observed by the bishops in the administration of their dioceses. As has been remarked by Dean Hook, in spite of several attempts in different reigns to revise the canons, no such revision or Reformation has ever been sanctioned by Parliament, so that the Church of England is, at this moment, under the canon law of the pre-Reformation Church, except in so far as that has been modified by statute law.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE ADVERTISEMENTS.



T was not merely doctrine that needed settlement in those times. Probably more grievous, because more present to the senses, was the irregularity in matters of ritual. The special Eucharistic Vestments, sanctioned by the rubric of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, had fallen into disuse. This, however, did not seem to distress Parker or the Queen; but the actual state of chaos into which the services of the Church seem to have fallen did very seriously disquiet them. Every one did what seemed right in his own eyes, and a very considerable party were bent upon resisting the plain commands of the Prayer Book.

The state of things is described in a forcible manner by Sir W. Cecil. Some, he declares, say the service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the Church. Some keep to the order of the Prayer Book; others introduce Psalms in metre. Some use a surplice; others are without a surplice. In some places the table stands in the body of the Church; in other places, in the chancel; or again altarwise. Administration of the Communion is done by some with surplice and cap; by others with none. Some have chalices, some a communion cup, others a common cup. Some use unleavened bread, some leavened. Some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting. Some baptize at a font,

some with a basin: some make the sign of the cross: others do not.

The Queen bore these irregularities very impatiently; and she represented to the Archbishop that it was his business to put a stop to them. But she was unwilling to favor any fresh legislation in Parliament, so that the responsibility was thrown upon the ecclesiastical courts; and, at the same time, while she refused to the bishops the help which they might properly claim, she threw the responsibility off from herself.

Parker did his best to give effect to the Queen's orders for uniformity. He published a set of "Articles" intended to bring about a more uniform state of things; but the Queen would not have them. Whether because they seemed, by their title, to have a doctrinal significance, which Elizabeth could not endure, or whether because some parts of them were of a doctrinal character, she refused to sanction them.

This refusal, on the part of the Queen, led to the publication, by the Archbishop, of the Advertisements, "partly for the due order in the public administration of common prayers and using the holy sacraments, and partly for the apparel of all persons ecclesiastical, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's letters commanding the same."

Parker wrote to Cecil (March, 1566), saying that he had "weeded out of the Articles all such of doctrine which peradventure stayed the book from the Queen's Majesty's approbation," and so forth. A prominent part of the Advertisements was that which took up the ordering of the ritual of the

Eucharist from the point to which it had been brought in the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth. There can be no question that the Elizabethan rubric sanctioned the Vestment, that is the Chasuble, for the Celebrant, and tunicles for the assistants; and that these were the legal vestments in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. But it is equally certain that the "vestment," properly so-called, was never worn but only the cope over the surplice, alb, or rochet.

The Advertisements gave a sanction to that which, since the accession of Elizabeth, had been customary, requiring the use of the surplice only in all parish churches, and the use of the cope in all Cathedral and Collegiate churches.

A heated discussion has arisen as to whether these Advertisements were authorized by the Queen. The Act of Uniformity had required that the vestments should be in use until the Queen should take further order. According to one class, the Queen did actually take this order in the Advertisements. According to another, these were simply Parker's working theories, to which the Queen had not given her consent. One should suppose that this controversy would have little interest for our own times, seeing that we have fresh rubrics for our guidance; but it is held by some that the meaning of our rubrics is partly determined by the authority of these Advertisements, so that it becomes necessary for us to give some slight attention to them.

Parker's "Articles," as they were first called, were sent to Cecil, March 3, 1565, for the signature of the Queen; but this was refused. They were then

modified and issued with the title of "Advertisements." It is quite evident that the Queen did not at once give them her sanction. "Did they receive the royal authority at all?" This is the question which is diversely answered. There can be no question that the Queen was earnestly set upon obtaining uniformity, and, as far as possible, dignity, in worship. Probably she would be unwilling to give up the special Eucharistic Vestment; yet, in the existing state of things, to have the surplice in all the parish churches and the cope in Cathedrals and Collegiate churches would be a great gain. Still the Queen was always reluctant to sanction new laws, as they seemed to abridge her own prerogatives; and on the other hand, she preferred that the bishops should bear the odium of bringing the law to bear upon recusants.

The Archbishop had the concurrence of the ecclesiastical commissioners in publishing the Advertisements: but how far had they royal authority? The Queen did not sign them when they were issued in 1566. But the Archbishop, in his Articles of Inquiry, 1569, speaks of them as having "public authority." So Archbishop Whitgift, in 1584, declares them to be authoritative, as do also the canons of 1571. These canons, however, did not receive royal confirmation. But, finally, they are recognized as of authority by the canons of 1603; and in these canons their ritual directions are repeated. They are also recognized in the canons of 1640. It may be mentioned that Mr. Parker, an authority on archæological and ecclesiastical subjects, and Lord

Selborne, a great lawyer, statesman, and churchman, debated this subject, the former holding that the Queen never sanctioned the Advertisements, the latter that she did. What more is necessary to be said on the subject may better be considered in another place.

At any rate Parker was resolved on having some kind of order in the Church, and he had come to think that, if some of the recusants should refuse and secede, it would be all the better for the Church. A good many of them were not only Calvinistic in doctrine, which was the case with most of the Clergy at that time: but they were also Presbyterian in discipline. It is remarkable that, in their antipathy to the surplice, they had not the support of the Swiss reformers. It did not seem a matter of much importance to Bullinger and others, what garment was worn, so long as no hindrance was offered to the publication of Christian truth. The English reformers, who had been engaged in struggles with the Roman party under Mary had contracted a dislike to everything which they associated with Roman doctrine or worship.

In the year 1565, one hundred and forty of the London clergy appeared before the Archbishop at Lambeth, and were required to make the declaration of conformity affixed to the Advertisements. All but thirty made the promise. In the next year they were again summoned before the ecclesiastical commission, when sixty-one made the declaration of conformity and thirty-seven refused. These were deprived or suspended. We are now at the beginning of the history of modern dissent in England. The

expelled had no mind to fall into merely lay communion with the established Church. They made public the nature of their offence in that they had "refused to wear the upper apparel and ministering garments of the Pope's Church," representing that these had been derived from heathen sources and perverted to gross superstition and idolatry. Even if they were indifferent, they said, which they could not concede, they ought not to be enforced against their clear convictions.

There was one body that the Archbishop could not reach, the University of Cambridge. Oxford had for some time been under what we should call High Church influence; but Cambridge was in the hands of the Puritans. And here, in some of the colleges, the students refused to wear surplices, and were supported, in their refusal, by the masters of the colleges. By a special privilege, conferred by Alexander VI., the universities had the power to licence twelve preachers annually without consent of the bishop. Hence these men not only preached without the bishop's licence, but also, like the members of the religious orders, in their academical habits. Parker was unable to get this privilege withdrawn.

This was not the only impediment to uniformity. There were men in the Queen's Council who, without the slightest personal sympathy with Puritan sentiment, put themselves forward as its supporters. Among these the unprincipled Earl of Leicester has been mentioned, who probably took this attitude out of opposition to Cecil.

The Puritans were far from agreement among

themselves. Some of the deprived remained in communion with the Church, officiating as they might find opportunity and permission. Some made the declaration, professed to conform, and took every possible opportunity of breaking or evading the law. Some writers on this period speak of this class as being the better affected to the Church; but a different judgment may be formed of their conduct. With regard to those who remained in the ministry of the Church, and conformed to rules which they disliked, living in hope of being able to have them changed, we cannot deny that they were in their rights; but the same thing can hardly be said of those who retained their posts, deliberately intending to violate the conditions on which they were held. With regard to those who left and made a beginning of schism in the Anglican Communion, we shall form different judgments according to our point of view. It has been said that they took the responsibility of separation solely and entirely on the question of the garment to be worn in Christian ministrations. It has also been said that they were the parents of the three hundred and eighty sects of the present day. At the same time, it must be remembered that these men made great sacrifices for conscience' sake; and even if they were narrow and self-willed, they were in this respect not unlike the great people whose qualities they illustrate. These were the first "Puritans," bearing a name which was intended to be a reproach, yet which has associations which are not altogether inglorious.

The position of the bishops was a difficult one.

Again they tried to obtain an Act of Parliament to enforce subscription (December, 1566); but the Queen would not hear of this; and although the Bill passed in the Commons, she had it stopped in the Lords, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishops. At the same time she gave the ecclesiastical commissioners to understand that she expected them to do their duty and to put a stop to unlawful assemblies. In consequence separatists to the number of a hundred were seized by the sheriffs of London at Plumbers' Hall, which they had hired on pretence of a wedding. They refused to make the least submission, and were put in prison; but this had no effect in suppressing the movement. Not only were the persecuted men convinced and fanatical, but they had the support of some of the councillors who were always glad to embarrass the action of the bishops. After encouraging the Puritans to rebellion, when these were not repressed, they were ready to complain of the general "negligence of the bishops of the realm!" The Archbishop was grieved and vexed, and did not conceal his vexation from the Queen, nor his regret at having accepted so thankless an office.

Notwithstanding the opposition of the Queen, it became impossible to keep ecclesiastical questions out of Parliament; and in that which met April, 1571, a proposition was introduced for further reform, and a commission of fourteen was actually appointed to confer with the bishops on the subject. A bill to compel subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles was also brought in. The temper of the

Commons was shown by the answer given by Wentworth, when the Archbishop suggested that the details of the measures should be left in the hands of the bishops. "No," he exclaimed, "by the faith I owe to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. That were to make you popes. Make you popes who list, we will make you none." However the Bill enforcing the Articles passed into law; and required that all ministers ordained by any other formula than that set forth in King Edward's time and now used should declare their assent to the Articles and subscribe them before the bishop; and that all having any ecclesiastical benefice should do the same, and declare their conformity before their congregation; and also read the Articles aloud. It was further provided that all incumbents hereafter appointed should read and subscribe the Articles within two months of their induction; that all admissions to benefices contrary to this Act should be *ipso facto* void; and that any minister teaching anything opposed to the Articles should be liable to deprivation. It was further enacted that no one should be ordained priest before the age of twenty-four; and none deacon until he had subscribed the Articles. The Queen had sent a message to the Commons, requiring them not to deal with this subject; but they were resolved upon it, and the Act passed, the Queen giving her assent, May 29, 1571. At the same time the Articles, revised by Bishop Jewel, were laid before the Convocation in Latin and in English, and both were subscribed by its members.

Several further attempts were made in the direc-

tion of legislation for the Church. A body of canons was drawn up by Convocation, but the Queen refused to confirm them. Then the body of laws known as the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum*, which had been drawn up in the reign of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. very nearly passed. The failure of this measure has been regarded as a great escape for the Church. In Parliament also some further attempts were made to puritanize the Church; but the Queen would yield no more. She would have no bills on religion introduced into Parliament until they had been first approved by Convocation; and finally she signified her utter disapproval of them before the House; and this put an end to that business.

It was soon after this (August 24, 1572), that there took place in France that shocking incident, known as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in which, by the orders of Charles IX., incited by his mother, Catharine de Medici, 70,000 Huguenots, including women and children, were murdered in cold blood in Paris and throughout France. The number above is that which Sully gives. Others make the number to range from 30,000 to 100,000. Above 500 persons of rank and 10,000 of lower condition perished in Paris alone. Pope Gregory XIII. ordered a "Te Deum" in thanksgiving. Philip of Spain declared that now at least his brother of France deserved his title of "Most Christian King." Elizabeth of England ordered her Court to go into mourning, and refused to see the French Ambassador.

Queen Elizabeth, however, had no mind to encourage or to tolerate nonconformity in England, and she

was equally resolved to throw the responsibility upon the bishops. She issued a proclamation, October 20, 1573, in which she says: "The fault is in you, to whom the special care of ecclesiastical matters doth appertain, and who have your visitations, episcopal and archidiaconal, and your synods, and such other meetings of the clergy, first and chiefly ordained for that purpose to keep all churches in your diocese in one uniform and godly order, and now is, as is commonly said (the more's the pity), to be only used of you and your officers to get money, or for some other purposes." The bishops naturally were little satisfied to accept such a rebuke. Grindal, of London, thought it very unfair to make such a sweeping condemnation, as though all were alike, "whereas," he says, "there is not like occasion given of all." Parkhurst, of Norwich, who was himself puritanically minded, and had been one of the defaulters, was now under the necessity of putting the law in force, which he did reluctantly and no further than he was compelled. "Less than this," he said to one who blamed him, "I cannot do, if I will avoid extreme danger." In this diocese of Norwich it is said that no fewer than 300 of the clergy were suspended, so that Bishop Parkhurst must have done his work with reasonable stringency.

The Puritan movement now began gradually to assume more definite forms. Whilst men like Jewel, Sandys, and Grindal accepted, with more or less satisfaction, the rules of the Church, and remained in her communion, and others remained simply in the hope of affecting changes, another class, finding

that the efforts made in the Parliament to puritanize the Church came to nothing, began to set up their own theory of Church doctrine and government as a system opposed to that which was now in possession. This was done in two addresses to Parliament, entitled the "First and Second Admonition," written by a number of the Puritan divines under the direction of Thomas Cartwright, a learned Cambridge divine, who was destined to be a leading man in that party. Cartwright was born about the year 1535, was educated at Cambridge, resided for a time at Geneva, where he became intimate with Beza, and returned to England about the beginning of 1570, when he was made Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. As fellow of Trinity College, in venting his Presbyterian views, he came into collision with Whitgift, the Master of Trinity, who was also Regius Professor of Divinity. Refusing to give up his Puritan notions he was deprived by Whitgift, as vice-chancellor, first of his professorship and then of his fellowship (1571).

For a time Cartwright remained in Church communion; but, when the ecclesiastical changes proposed in Parliament failed, and subscription to the Articles was made compulsory, and other measures of a similar character were taken, then the admonitions to Parliament appeared, condemning the existing state of things in the Church, and praying Parliament for a discipline more consonant to the Word of God and the other Reformed Churches. The authors, Field and Wilcox, were sent to Newgate, October 12, 1572; and Cartwright produced the

Second Admonition, and was answered by Whitgift. These controversial works are of considerable importance, as setting forth the different points of view of the Puritan party and the Church in regard to doctrine and discipline. Cartwright contended for the Bible and the Bible only, as the rule of faith and discipline. Whitgift, in this partially anticipating the more famous work of Hooker, maintained that the Bible was the standard of faith, but not of discipline. Then came, in 1573, the organization of the first Presbytery in England. In 1575 Cartwright published his second reply to Whitgift, and in 1577, after his flight from England, he supplemented this reply.

But before this the good Archbishop had passed to his rest, dying May 17, 1575, being nearly seventy-one years of age. He had borne with great resolution and patience the heavy burden of duties laid upon him by his high office and the many difficulties arising from his peculiar circumstances. One thought lay very near to his heart, the necessities of the Church and the poverty-stricken condition of the Clergy, arising, in part, from the way in which the revenues of the Church had been appropriated by the favorites of the Court and the Queen herself. In this respect Elizabeth contrasts very unfavorably with her sister Mary. Parker wrote to the Queen, from his deathbed, in very energetic terms, rebuking her for her own share in this business, and for her allowing others to do the same. It is said that he mentioned Burleigh (Cecil) and Bacon by name, and that they prevented the letter from coming into the Queen's hands.

CHAPTER XXII.

GRINDAL AND THE PROPHESYINGS.



HE successor of Parker in the Archbishopric of Canterbury was Grindal, Archbishop of York, and formerly Bishop of London. It cannot be said that he was a man eminently fitted for the post: he certainly was not a man of the same school as Parker, or with the same ability and decision of character. But he had administered his former diocese with more than average success, he was regarded as a man of an amiable disposition; and on one occasion at least, he showed that he was not lacking in principle nor unwilling to suffer for its maintenance. It would appear that he obeyed the call to Canterbury with some reluctance and with a consciousness of the difficulties before him.

The Puritans had, in fact, become more and more unmanageable. "They are laboring," says Bishop Cox in 1573, "to bring about a revolution in our Church;" and Grindal gives an account of their policy which can be verified from what we know of their writings and opinions. "Our affairs, after the settlement of the question respecting ceremonies," he says, "were for some time very quiet, when some virulent pamphlets came forth in which almost the whole external policy of the Church was attacked. They maintain that archbishops and bishops should alto-

gether be reduced to the ranks; that the ministers of the Church ought to be elected solely by the people, that in every city, town, parish, or village, a consistory should be established, consisting of the minister and elders of the place, who alone are to decide on all ecclesiastical affairs."

And here, unfortunately, the rapacious courtier was only too willing to make a tool of the Puritan for his own ends; and there was always the fear that the Queen would allow Leicester to have his way, especially as she had no scruples of appropriating Church revenues to the crown by keeping bishoprics vacant, sometimes for many months.

The Parliament which met in February, 1576, brought before the Queen a petition for the reformation of discipline in the Church. The Queen, who had actually disallowed canons drawn up by Convocation in 1572 for that purpose, as usual, threw the blame of all disorders upon the bishops. Grindal, however, renewed the effort of Parker by laying before Convocation a set of fifteen articles "touching the admission of apt and fit persons to the ministry, and the establishing of good order in the Church." Some of these articles which were probably intended to conciliate the Puritans, were struck out by the Queen. One of these allowed marriages to be celebrated all the year through, and another forbade the administration of baptism except by a lawful minister. These articles are not only the first disciplinary regulations in the Church of England after the Reformation; but they are the foundation of much subsequent legislation.

During Parker's time the complaints had been frequent as to the paucity of preachers; but things seem now to have greatly improved. Grindal says that where there were only three or four before, there are now forty or fifty, which shows very considerable progress. Still there was, especially in some localities, a great dearth of Christian teaching. In order to supply this want there sprang up a peculiar kind of institution known as "Prophesyings," being something partaking of the character of a Church congress and a prayer meeting, sometimes made up of the Clergy alone, sometimes of Clergy and laity united.

We can easily understand the benefits and the disadvantages of gatherings of this kind. On the one hand, at a time when education was little diffused and religious instruction could sometimes be had with difficulty, if at all, much gain might result from such conferences. On the other hand, there was the danger not merely of merging the distinctively ministerial character altogether, but of encouraging ill-considered, uneducated, and mischievous utterances which would work evil to those taking part in these meetings and to the Church at large.

It was quite natural that Queen Elizabeth should be more impressed with the evils of disorder than by the advantages of the diffusion of religious knowledge, and accordingly she directed Archbishop Parker to give orders to Bishop Parkhurst to "repress immediately these vain prophesyings." Some of the Puritan Privy Councillors having encouraged

him to resume them, he applied to Parker for guidance, and was peremptorily ordered in the Queen's name to put a stop to them. Parkhurst immediately obeyed.

Some time afterwards Grindal, thinking that probably it was only the abuse of the prophesyings that was objected to, issued a set of directions as to the proper management of them. Elizabeth rebuked him for what he had done, and declared that she would have no more of these prophesyings. Apparently the Archbishop received the command to stop them without answering. But when he thought the matter over, he saw that he could not conscientiously do as he had been ordered. The Queen had also discouraged the multiplying of preachers; and here again he could not honestly fall in with her views. Grindal, accordingly, wrote to the Queen, remonstrating with her on her intrusion into the sphere of the bishops, and pointing out that he could not conscientiously obey her command. "I cannot, with safe conscience," he says, "and without the offence of the majesty of God, give my consent to the suppressing of these exercises. I choose rather to offend your earthly Majesty than the heavenly majesty of God." In conclusion he reminded her Majesty that, although she was a mighty Prince, yet there was a mightier to whom they both must answer.

The Queen, enraged at his resistance, called a meeting of the Court of Star Chamber, and proposed that the Archbishop should be deprived; but was persuaded to be content with his suspension and confinement to his palace until he should submit.

We shall see that, subsequently, this policy was not consistently pursued; but for the present the Queen was determined to have her own way. She, accordingly, ordered a letter to be addressed to all the bishops, directing them at once to see that these exercises were suppressed; and as none of them wished to share the fate of the Archbishop, her Majesty was obeyed. Some did so quite readily and cheerfully, some apparently not unwilling to have a fling at the Archbishop; but others reluctantly and sadly. Thus Cox, of Ely, wrote to Burleigh, expressing a hope that her Majesty might further consider the matter, and especially how great need there was for religious instruction, considering the ignorance, idleness, and lewdness of many of the Clergy.

The Archbishop was not moved; and after a year, during which efforts had been vainly made to induce him to give in, the Queen again asked the Star Chamber to deprive him; but was induced to consent merely to a renewal of his suspension. This, however, did not stop the whole of his work as bishop. Although in those circumstances he could not preside over the Convocation, he yet was able to hold his visitations, to consecrate, and to ordain.

When the Convocation met, they entreated the Queen to restore their president, an appeal to which her Majesty paid no attention. She was pleased, however, to give permission to Convocation to consider the best way of removing certain abuses in the Church. One of the grievances complained of was the frequent infliction of the penalty of excommunication by lay judges, and for the most frivolous

reasons. The Upper House concluded that such a sentence should be inflicted only by the bishop in his court. But the Lower House dissented, apparently because many members would thereby lose power and perhaps fees. Through this disagreement hardly anything was accomplished by this Convocation.

At last, after about five years' suspension, the Archbishop was induced to make a qualified submission to the Queen, admitting that some of the bishops, by whom she had been informed, might have found those exercises injurious, saying also that he did not doubt her Majesty meant well by the order she had given, that he was himself sorry that he had vexed her, and that he was only troubled at being made the instrument of putting down things which might be useful. However, in his own diocese he had stopped them. The suspension was then taken off.

As already hinted, her Majesty's councillors were not, in this matter, remarkable for their consistency. Two or three years after the Archbishop's submission, in the year 1585, the Bishop of Chester, writing to his clergy, set forth that "the Lords of her Majesty's most honorable Privy Council," after due consideration of the interests of religion, had "recommended some further enlargements of the ecclesiastical exercises to the end they might be more frequently used;" and in fact, they are now to be encouraged, instead of being put down, since "much good hath ensued of this exercise."

But by this time the Archbishop had passed beyond the reach of human censure or approval. He

had become old and blind and unfit for the discharge of his episcopal duties: it was therefore suggested to him that he should resign, which he prepared to do with some apparent unwillingness. But before the details were settled he died, July 6, 1583, about seventy years of age. If Grindal cannot be placed among the great bishops of the Church, and if he was not quite equal to the difficult circumstances of his position, it cannot be denied that he was a sincere, devout, conscientious Christian, and one who was ready to suffer at the call of duty.

CHAPTER XXIII.

WHITGIFT AND PURITANISM.

HEN hearing of Cartwright's doings at Cambridge, we learned that he was disciplined by a vigorous Master of Trinity College named Whitgift, a native of Lincolnshire, born at Grimsby, in 1530. At the death of Grindal he was about fifty-three and he had become Bishop of Worcester in 1577. While Dean of Lincoln, he had been made Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1572, and had been appointed by Parker to answer Cartwright. Here was a man recognized as scholar, administrator, disciplinarian, in a high degree qualified for high office, and the choice of the sage Queen fell upon him for the Archbishopric of Canterbury.

Prominent at this time among the Puritans were the Separatists who were beginning to fall apart among themselves, and develop new forms of dissidence. The first of the Separatists were those who espoused the Presbyterian form of government, and set up their first Presbytery in London in 1573. But now another sect arose called the Brownists, who may be said to be the ancestors of the modern Independents or Congregationalists. The founder of this sect was Robert Brown, a clergyman in Norfolk; and for a time chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk, through whose influence probably it was that he escaped

deprivation for a time. After being a schoolmaster, he became a lecturer and itinerant preacher, and in this capacity went about inveighing against the Church and the bishops. In 1581 he was committed by the Bishop of Norwich to the custody of the Sheriff, but was very soon released, and in 1582 he published a book on the "Life and Manners of all True Christians," with a preface on "Reformation without tarrying for any." In this book he set forth the iniquity of those who could acquiesce in the present church system and the still greater depravity of those who remained in a church the laws and observances of which they did not approve. Upon this he was again put in prison but released at the intercession of Lord Burleigh; and this happened a good many times. In fact, Brown boasted that he had seen the inside of thirty-two prisons. At length he fled to Holland with a number of like-minded people, and set up a congregation at Middelburg. But contentions broke out among them; and Brown got "weary of his office," and in 1589 returned to England, conformed, and became incumbent of a parish in Northamptonshire. The principle of the denomination of which Brown may be called the founder was the independence of each congregation in regard both to doctrine and discipline; and although the congregations generally adopted the Presbyterian confessions, and in later times formed a union of churches, this was no part of their system, and was a virtual surrender of their principles.

The secession of Brown did not lead to the suppression of the sect, and another leader was found,

named Barrow, from whom they got the name of Barrowists, as they had got that of Brownists from their first founder. They became very numerous in England, as we shall see more particularly when we come to the commonwealth period, and were very bitter and outspoken against the Church, especially against those of the Puritan teachers who remained in her communion. In 1583, two of them were put to death, and in 1593 three more, Barrow being one of the three. More of this denomination perished after 1593, when they emigrated to Holland. From thence in 1620 a number of them sailed in the Mayflower for the American continent: they have been known in history as the "Pilgrim Fathers."

The Presbyterians and the Independents may be called the legitimate offspring of English Puritanism. This can hardly be said of the sect of Anabaptists, or rather of the sects which were so designated, for among them there was a considerable variety of opinions. One class, which at first was not very prominent, differed from the Independents only in rejecting Infant Baptism and perhaps in holding to a more rigid Calvinism. They are represented by the large and influential denomination now known as Baptists, although these have now, to a great extent, given up the Calvinism of their forefathers.

Of the other Anabaptists there were several divisions. One sect was known as the "Family of Love" and derived its principles from Henry Nicholas, of Amsterdam. They held mystical and quietist opinions, allegorizing and spiritualizing the historical facts recorded in Scripture. Living, as they

thought, in a sphere above the contentions of discordant sects, they had a great antipathy to the Puritans with whom they were in danger of being confounded. They did not persist as a sect; but some of their tendencies came out in the Quakers of a later time.

But the Anabaptists who were the most troublesome and the most dangerous are those who were commonly known by that name in Germany, not long after the outbreak of the Reformation. They were enthusiasts who held communistic principles, denying the authority of the State and the laws, the right to hold property, and the obligation of an oath. In Germany they had become a serious danger to the peace of the Empire and had stirred up civil war. In England they seem to have been contented with propagating their opinions without giving practical effect to them. Yet this had not prevented them from being persecuted. Many of them suffered death under Henry VIII. A considerable proportion of those who suffered under Mary were Anabaptists. One suffered under Edward VI. Under Elizabeth eleven of them were sentenced to be burnt, and two actually suffered death in this way (July 22, 1575); but the horror of the people showed that the days of burning had gone by.

But there was another party, to which frequent reference has been made, namely that of the Puritans who remained in the communion and even in the ministry of the Church, with the deliberate intention of revolutionizing the whole system of service and discipline. These men had adopted as their stand-

ard, the "Book of Discipline," drawn up on the Swiss model by Cartwright and Travers, and resolved to stand by it, whilst they were supported in this endeavor by the mass of the Separatists. They even went so far as to insist that men episcopally ordained were not valid ministers, and they established a sort of presbytery, in various parts, called a *Classis*, by which real ordination was to be conferred. This classis was also to decide what measure of ritual might be used by those belonging to their association. It was, in fact, a deliberate attempt to set aside the actual system of the Church, or to concede to it only a kind of legal right; whilst all the spiritual power and authority was to be vested in the presbyteries.

In Whitgift, however, they met a man who was quite as resolute in giving effect to his own and the Church's theory of discipline, as they were to improve that which they had now chosen. He was confirmed September, 1583, and immediately afterwards issued a body of articles, prepared after consultation with the other bishops, requiring the clergy to subscribe three special articles on pain of deprivation: 1. The Royal Supremacy; 2. The Book of Common Prayer; and 3. The Articles of Religion of 1563. These articles were not new; but they had never been generally enforced; and their contents were ostentatiously set at naught by some of the Puritan preachers. The articles were sent to the bishops October 19, and these were required to return the names of all the clergy in the diocese, and to say whether they conformed to the articles now sent

forth. The Archbishop knew well that such a demand would stir up a strenuous opposition; but he was quite prepared for it.

A new Ecclesiastical Commission was appointed, entrusted with the duty of giving effect to the Archbishop's policy, the Queen becoming at last aware of the necessity of giving the bishops a more powerful support. Some of the recusants brought a complaint before the Privy Council who, on their part, summoned the Archbishop to appear before them. But Whitgift was too sure of his position to be intimidated. He told the Council that they were exceeding their rights, and that the Puritans whose cause they were espousing were really playing into the hands of the Papists. The Council, by their interference, were only rendering it impossible for him to perform the duty which her Majesty looked for at his hands. The Council, knowing that they would have the Queen to deal with as well as the Archbishop, ceased to protest.

But there were other ways of annoying the Primate, and the Council thought to do so by drawing up a set of inquiries, as to the manner in which the bishops had done their duties, really intending to suggest that the troubles of the Church were the result of their neglect of duty. Instead of being aggrieved at this, the Archbishop readily forwarded the Articles to the bishops, glad to have opportunity of stimulating his colleagues to do their work. Another measure he took, which in ordinary circumstances could hardly be justified, and which brought him into considerable trouble, namely the drawing up of

a set of twenty-four articles, which were to be applied to any one suspected of nonconformity, from which he was to be required to purge himself on oath. The clerk of the Council, by name Beale, a somewhat pronounced Puritan, who was always ready to annoy the Archbishop, made an insolent attack upon him on this occasion. It is said that the Earl of Leicester went so far as to plot against his life. But still more grievous was the disapproval of Lord Burleigh, who said, he found the Articles "so curiously penned, that I think the Inquisition in Spain use not so many questions to comprehend and to trap their prey. According to my simple judgment this kind of proceeding is too much savoring of the Roman Inquisition, and is rather a device to seek for offenders than to reform any." Whitgift replied that he had only followed the methods of some other courts, and that he had done nothing which he did not regard as of absolute necessity. Moreover he pointed out—and here is the best defence of his measure—that the people at whom these Articles were aimed worked in secret, so that witnesses could hardly be procured. In fact, it cannot be denied that the methods of some of the Puritans justified the adoption of exceptional measures.

The real trouble in this matter was that most of the Privy Councillors who supported the Puritan side were simply endeavoring to throw discredit upon the bishops, and they were not at all scrupulous as to the means which they adopted for that purpose. As for the Queen, whilst she sustained Whitgift in his endeavors to maintain discipline, she vexed him

by her resolute and persevering depredations on the revenues of the Church. At one time there were no fewer than five sees vacant, the revenues all coming to the Queen.

About this time Whitgift had another dispute with Lord Burleigh, which has considerable interest for more reasons than one. The mastership of the Temple having become vacant, Burleigh wished the post to be bestowed upon Walter Travers, his chaplain and reader at the Temple. But Travers was not only without episcopal orders, having been merely called by a congregation at Antwerp, and ordained by a presbytery, but he was joint author with Cartwright of the "Book of Discipline."

It would have been impossible for Whitgift to sanction the appointment of such a man without incurring the charge of absolute inconsistency. He therefore wrote to the Queen, telling her what the principles of Travers were, and recommending one of her chaplains, Dr. Bond, for the place. As a consequence, Burleigh withdrew his candidate, but on the condition that the Archbishop should do the same. The man chosen as master of the Temple was one whose name will live with the English Church and the English language, Richard Hooker.

At this time the balance hung so even between the two parties that it might seem rash to predict whether Anglicanism or Puritanism should obtain the upper hand in England. It was the fixed resolve of the Puritans to get rid of the Book of Common Prayer, and to put in its place the "Directory of Public Worship," and also to destroy the whole

episcopal constitution of the Church. A considerable proportion of the English people were in favor of these changes. Several members of the Privy Council were, for different reasons, ready to assist in bringing them about. It is owing to Queen Elizabeth and Archbishop Whitgift, under God, that these dangers were averted. Whatever our judgment may be of the virtues or the faults of this great Queen, she had not followed in the footsteps of her brother and sister, and so produced a reaction against the system which she upheld, nor had she left to her successors an encouragement to take the course which proved so fatal. Elizabeth left the Church of England stronger, and more fully established in its own special principles than she found it.

But the House of Commons was long under Puritan influence. A Bill was brought in for the "Reformation of the Church" intended to introduce changes in a Puritan direction. Only the assurance that the Queen would quash it led to its withdrawal. Even then the Lower House adopted a petition to the House of Lords embodying the principal points in the Bill. These were very sweeping, and recommended, that priests should be put on a level with bishops in regard to the power of ordination, that no ordination should take place without a call from a congregation, that subscriptions should be done away with, prophesyings restored, and all dispensations abolished.

What the real opinion of the House of Lords may have been, it is not quite easy to say. There was no doubt, however, of the opinion of the Queen; and

the petition was rejected. The Archbishop, determined to place the discipline of the Church on a firmer basis, took the opportunity of drawing up a body of canons in Convocation, which he placed in the hands of the Queen, so that when the petition from the Lower House was brought to her, she was able to say that order had already been taken upon many points raised in it. These canons were passed by the Convocation of Canterbury, and received the royal assent, March 23, 1585. Their provisions are of considerable importance, and some of them may here be noted. In regard to ordination, candidates were required to have a title in the diocese in which they were ordained, to be of full age, graduates, or at least able to give an account of their faith in Latin. Licences for marriages were not to be given save under sufficient bonds that there is consent of parents and no legal impediment. Excommunications for moral offences were to be pronounced by the bishop or some dignified ecclesiastic; for contumacy, by the official. Pluralities were restricted, fees were regulated; and inquiries were to be made annually into the learning and morals of the clergy. This did not suit the Puritans at all; and they attempted to bring their theories into Parliament. But the Queen put a stop to these attempts by dissolving Parliament with some plain and stern words. Referring to the Puritans she spoke of them as "fault-finders" and said there was no institution with which fault might not be found. At the same time she admonished the bishops, hinting that, if they did not amend, she was minded to depose them.

And then she brought out her favorite formula. She would not, she said, show favors to Romanists, but neither would she tolerate new fangledness. She meant to guide both by God's good rule.

There is nothing more striking in all these controversies than the good sense, the moderation, and the resolute consistency of the Archbishop. Whether it was a Puritan who wanted to revolutionize the Church, or the Queen or a courtier who would plunder her possessions, or an attempt was made to set aside the recognized discipline of the Church, the Archbishop was ready to enter his protest. Finding the inconvenience of being outside the Council he succeeded in being made a member of it in February, 1586, together with two noblemen upon whom he could depend.

In the next Parliament, meeting October, 1586, the Puritans, not dismayed by their defeat in the previous Parliament, had it moved (February 27, 1587), "that all laws then in force touching the ecclesiastical settlement might be repealed, and that the Book of Discipline might be adopted as the legal settlement of Discipline and Public Worship." Permission was refused to introduce the Bill; and the Queen, on being made aware of the motion, declared that she was "fully satisfied with the reformation that had taken place, and minded not now to begin to settle herself in causes of religion," adding that the proposals now made were most "prejudicial to the religion established, to her crown, her government, and her subjects." She thought it not well that they should always be making new laws, and,

in her opinion, the Clergy were the best judges in such matters. This attempt having failed, a number of the Puritan Clergy united and subscribed the Book of Discipline, it is said, to the number of five hundred.

As is common, in such circumstances, some of them were in favor of immediate action, and of an endeavor to secure a reformation "in the best manner possible." Others favored the inculcation of their principles, and the exercise of patience until the people should be better instructed in these matters. But the party of violence could not be restrained; and then broke out a controversy which reflects, perhaps, greater disgrace upon the Puritan Party than any other incident in its history. Bearing in mind that controversialists in those days were not very choice in their language, and making all allowance for the circumstances, it can hardly be denied that the Marprelate Controversy was disgraceful.

The first of the tracts issued by "Martin Marprelate"—a designation adopted by a number of writers acting in concert—appeared in 1588. It was answered not very powerfully by Bishop Cooper who gives his impression of the publication in the following remarks: "The author calleth himself by a feigned name, 'Martin Marprelate:' a very fit name undoubtedly. But if this outrageous spirit of boldness be not stopped speedily, I fear he will prove himself to be not only Mar-prelate, but Mar-prince, Mar-state, Mar-law, Mar-magistrate, and all together, until he bring it to an anabaptistical equality and community."

It is not quite easy for us, in these days, to understand the spirit in which this controversy was conducted. Heylin's account of it is not exaggerated. He says, "they could find no other title for the Archbishop than Beelzebub of Canterbury, Pope of Lambeth, the Canterbury Caiaphas, Esau, a monstrous antichrist, a most bloody oppressor of God's saints, a very antichristian beast, most bloody tyrant. The bishops are described as unlawful, unnatural, false, and bastardly governors of the Church, the ordinances of the devil, petty popes, petty antichrists, incarnate devils, bishops of the devil, cogging cozening knaves, who will lie like dogs. They are proud, papist, profane, presumptuous, paltry, pestilent, pernicious prelates and usurpers, enemies of God and the state. The clergy are popish priests, or monks, or friars, ale-hunters, or boys or lads, or drunkards, and dolts, hogs, dogs, wolves, foxes, simoniacs, usurpers, proctors of antichrist, popish chapmen, bolting neutrals, greedy dogs to fill their paunches, desperate and forlorn atheists, a cursed uncircumcised murdering generation, a crew of bloody soul-murderers, sacrilegious Church-robbers, and followers of antichrist." The Convocation is similarly characterized; and the Prayer Book is pronounced to be "a book full of corruption, many of the contents against the Word of God, the sacraments wickedly mangled and profaned therein; the Lord's Supper not eaten, but made a pageant and a stage-play; the form of public baptism full of childish and superstitious toys."

Attempts were made to capture the authors or

printers of these libels; but the printing press was moved about from place to place, until it was seized at Manchester while printing a reply to Bishop Cooper, under the title, "Hay any work for Cooper?" The laymen who had furnished funds had a fine imposed upon them, which they were not required to pay. Penry, the worst of the writers, for the time managed to escape. Udal, convicted of having written a tract entitled the "Declaration," was condemned to die under the libel law of 1581. By the intercession of Whitgift he obtained a pardon, but died in prison. Penry, whom they had failed to convict, fled to Scotland; but continued to issue pamphlets of the most scurrilous character against the bishops and the Queen. Returning to England, he was arrested and put to death.

These evidences of the vitality of Puritanism and of its unrelenting hostility to the established order of things in Church and State decided the authorities to strike at what they regarded as the root of the evil. Accordingly Cartwright was summoned before the ecclesiastical commissioners and required to purge himself by oath from various violations of the law. On refusing to take the oath he was committed to the Fleet, together with a number of ministers who had made a similar refusal. After being detained for a short time, Cartwright, on the intercession of the Archbishop, was set at liberty; and, in short, the difficulty of applying this law was soon made manifest, so that it was determined to take other measures.

This was taken in hand in the Parliament of

1593. The Queen's speech informed the members that they had been summoned in order to "compel by some sharp means to a more due obedience those that neglected the service of God. The Marprelate Tracts had done their work in a sense very different from that of their writers. The House of Commons of the earlier period had been ready for all kinds of Puritan innovations; but now, when it was proposed to bring in a bill against the Church courts and the oath, the Commons enacted, instead, a law, providing "that if any person or persons above the age of sixteen years should obstinately refuse to repair to some church, chapel, or usual place of common prayer to hear divine service established, or shall forbear to do the same for the space of a month without lawful cause," and a great deal more to the same effect, "that then every person so offending and convicted of it, should be committed unto prison without bail or mainprise till he or they should testify their conformity by coming to some church, chapel, or other place of common prayer to hear divine service, and to make open submission and declaration of the same, in such form or manner as by the said statute was provided." In case of the submission not being made within three months, the recusant was to be banished, and, if he returned without leave, he was to be put to death.

By this means a double advantage was secured, the odium of enforcing discipline was partly removed from the ecclesiastical authorities, and a good many of the disaffected left the country, reinforcing those who had already gone abroad. Some did not wait to

be expatriated, but petitioned that they might be allowed to emigrate to the Western Continent where they might worship God according to their consciences, and do her Majesty some service "against the persecuting Spaniards." Some also, who had been kept in prison, in the hope of their being brought to submission, were now allowed to go free and leave the country.

The Queen and the bishops could hardly believe that they had at last secured unanimity in religion, or even uniformity; but they had made considerable progress in that direction. Puritanism still existed and had by no means relinquished its principles or its plans. Romanism had still its adherents, although their hopes had been weaker since the death of Mary Stuart in 1588. But the people at large were contented with the Church as it was, and as the Queen and Parker and Whitgift had made it.

A bolder work on behalf of episcopacy was struck by Dr. Bancroft (afterwards Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury) in his sermon at Paul's Cross, February 9, 1589. Instead of defending episcopacy as a lawful form of church government, he contended that there was no ground whatever, in the New Testament, for Presbyterian principles, but only for episcopacy. "There was never," he declared, "ancient Father since the Apostles' time, were he never so learned or studious of the truth, there was never particular church council or synod, or any man of judgment that ever lived till these later times, that did even so much as dream of such a meaning. It is most manifest that there hath been a diverse govern-

ment from this [the Presbyterian] used in the Church ever since the Apostles' time. . . There is no man living, as I suppose, able to show where there was any church planted ever since the Apostles' time, but there the bishop had authority over the rest of the ministry." Other writers arose on the same side, chief among whom was Thomas Bilson, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, author of a book on the "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church," published in 1593.

But the episcopate was not the only question in debate between the Puritans and the Churchmen. Two years after the publication of Bilson's work there appeared a book setting forth those views of the Lord's Day which were afterwards known as sabbatarian. It had not been customary, up to this time, to base the obligation of the Lord's Day upon the Jewish law; but upon custom, utility, and the rule of the Church. In 1595, however, a book appeared, written by a Puritan minister named Bound, in which he declared that the keeping of the Sabbath was not merely a positive precept, but a moral law, since in the very nature of things it was necessary to rest every seventh day; and that the Christian rest should be of the same kind as that required of the Jews. It should be a day of rest and abstention from all labor, and a day of worship; not a day of recreation and amusement. There was a double reason for the course now taken. They wanted to put a stop to the sports; and they were resolved to assign to the festivals of the Church a distinctly lower place than that which was claimed for the Lord's day.

When we consider how strong is the influence of asceticism over religious minds, especially in times of revival, and how the appearance of asceticism has often been maintained by those who had no sympathy with the spirit out of which it sprang, we shall not wonder so much at the exaggerated opinions on this subject which speedily became current. It is possible that their adversaries have imputed to the Puritans sentiments and expressions for which they were not wholly responsible; yet the testimony on the subject is so general and consentient that there cannot be much exaggeration in the accounts given of their beliefs and habits. Thus, one is said to have declared that the doing of work on the Lord's Day was as great a sin as murder or adultery; and the same was said of the ringing of more than one bell on the Lord's Day. Churchmen, headed by Whitgift, set themselves against what they regarded as mischievous errors; but the religious spirit of the age was against them, and it cannot be doubted that this movement, which went on increasing in force, contributed largely to the fashioning of the sombre character and disposition of the Puritans in the Commonwealth.

Still more serious and threatening, however, was a controversy which arose on the subject of the divine decrees, and became embodied in a series of articles which came near to being imposed upon the Church of England, as part of her doctrinal system. To those who consider the Elizabethan period from the point of view of our own times, the influence of Calvinism at that time may seem a very extraordi-

nary phenomenon, as it certainly was a very potent element in the life of the day. When, however, it is remembered that nearly all the great reformers, preëminently Luther and Calvin, were disciples of St. Augustine; and that the theology of that great father became the basis of the great Protestant Confessions, our surprise may cease. Luther might be called a pure Augustinian. Even the supralapsarianism of Calvin was different more in appearance than in reality, giving a kind of logical completeness to the older system. Besides it can hardly be denied that, as the Jansenists adhered to Augustine, whilst the Jesuits were tainted with Pelagianism, it was not unnatural that Arminianism and Romanism on the one hand, and Calvinism and Protestantism on the other, should come to be associated.

These considerations may help us to understand how even a Churchman so strong and anti-puritanical as Whitgift should have given in to this tendency. The controversy arose through the denial of the indefectibility of faith, in a sermon preached at Cambridge, by Mr. Barret, a fellow of Caius College. Dr. Whitaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity, had the matter brought before the Archbishop, who appointed a body of divines to consider and report upon the subject. As a result they drew up the following nine propositions, generally known as the Lambeth Articles: 1. God hath from eternity predestinated some to life, and reprobated others to death. 2. The moving cause of Predestination to life is not the prevision of faith or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the per-

son predestinated; but only the will of the good pleasure of God. 3. The predestinated are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be diminished nor increased. 4. Such as are not predestinated to salvation will inevitably be condemned on account of their sins. 5. A true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, nor vanish away in the elect, either totally or finally. 6. A true believer, that is, one endued with justifying faith, is certified by the full assurance of faith that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved through Christ. 7. Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men, by which they might be saved, if they would. 8. No man can come to Christ, unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son. 9. It is not put in the will and power of every man to be saved.

These Articles were not the work of any regularly constituted assembly, neither were they accepted by the Church; but they were for some time used as a practical test in the case of persons suspected of Arminianism. It is not very likely that Convocation would have sanctioned them; but Queen Elizabeth and her powerful minister gave them no opportunity of doing so. Her Majesty declared to the Archbishop that "she misliked much that any allowance had been given by his Grace and the rest, for any such points to be disputed, being a matter tender and dangerous to weak ignorant minds;" and Bur-

leigh told Whitaker that they were "charging God with cruelty, and might make men to be desperate in their wickedness."

The Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles having been assailed by the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, a Frenchman named Peter Baro, the Vice-chancellor, Dr. Good, charged him with heresy, and the Archbishop accorded a certain sympathy to the Vice-chancellor; but whether the royal influence induced prudential considerations, or whether a further study of the question, aided by the suggestions of other divines, led him to modify his views of Calvinism, the Archbishop managed to put a stop to the controversy.

This business of the Lambeth Articles undoubtedly helps candid students of English Church History to determine the question whether the Article (XVII.) on Predestination and Election is to be understood in a Calvinistic sense. It is obvious to remark that, if that were the case, the Lambeth Articles would have been unnecessary; and, if they formed merely an exposition of the teaching of the seventeenth article, there could have been no serious opposition to their adoption. Apart, however, from the controversial aspect of the matter, certain points are theologically certain. In the first place, the Lambeth Articles are pure and undiluted Calvinism; whereas the seventeenth article is not even definitely Augustinian. It may be described as simply Pauline, for there is not a phrase or an expression which does not come, literally or in effect, from the writings of St. Paul. If it is said that it is patient of an Augustinian

or Calvinistic meaning, the simple answer must be, that it is susceptible of such a meaning just as the writings of St. Paul are so susceptible, and in no other sense. It is quite clear that the compilers of the Article meant to leave its meaning so far open, neither excluding Calvinists from the ministry of the Church, nor compelling all to be of that way of thinking.

The subject of the treatment of Roman Catholics in the reign of Elizabeth has been much discussed; but the matter is in reality very simple. It is to the action of the papal see that we must refer in order to understand the measures taken against the Roman Catholics. For some time the Queen had hopes of uniting all her subjects in one Church; and the Roman Catholics, for a time, attended the parish churches. Pius IV. hoped, by patience and forbearance, to win back the Queen of England to the fold; but his successor, Pius V., was determined on more offensive action; and in 1569 he fulminated an excommunication against her. The result was far from satisfactory. "If," says Lingard, "the Pontiff promised himself any particular benefit from this measure, the result must have disappointed his expectations. The time was gone by when the thunders of the Vatican could shake the thrones of princes. By foreign powers the bull was suffered to sleep in silence; among the English Catholics it served only to breed doubts, dissension, and dismay. . . All agreed that it was, in their regard, an imprudent and cruel expedient, which rendered them liable to the suspicion of disloyalty, and afforded their enemies a

pretence to brand them with the name of traitors." This is the deliberate judgment of a calm and thoughtful Roman Catholic historian.

For a time the result was not obvious. The Roman Catholics might hold their services in private, if they chose. An Act of Parliament was passed in 1571, by way of reply to the Papal Bull, declaring all to be traitors, who should become reconciled to the see of Rome, or who should bring any Papal Bulls into the country. But this did not deter some zealous Roman Catholic priests from undertaking a mission to England, partly to keep alive the faith among members of their Church, and partly in the hope of winning back others to the fold. If these men had confined themselves to merely religious instruction, it is probable that the Government might have connived at their doings. But it was made quite clear that loyalty to the Pope meant disloyalty and treason against the Queen of England.

In 1577 Cuthbert Mayne was put to death for having brought in a bull; but the meaning of his offence was his holding the right of Roman Catholics to rise in insurrection against the government of the Queen. In 1580 two Jesuit priests, Parsons and Campion came over, authorized to explain that the bull of deposition laid upon Roman Catholics no obligation to immediate action. At the same time they prosecuted their missionary work with great ardor.

In 1581 Parliament passed the first of the Recusancy Laws. These went further than the Act of 1571, now inflicting fines and imprisonment for say-

ing or hearing Mass, and fines upon those even who refused to go to church. From this time Roman Catholics were sometimes subjected to torture, to make them give information which might lead to the apprehension of priests. Parsons escaped to the continent from which he directed operations in England. Campion was taken and executed (1581). It seemed necessary to the ordinary loyal Englishman to crush the brood of conspirators against the rule and life of the Queen who were now springing up. There can be no doubt that the assassination of the Queen was plotted by those who set a price upon the head of William the Silent, and brought about his assassination in 1584. We suppose, the Jesuits would have had no scruple in making away with the Queen, even if in doing so some of them had sacrificed their own lives.

The offences for which the Roman Catholics suffered under Elizabeth were political offences. "Our religion is our only crime," pleaded some of them; but they must have known better. When they were required to say what they thought of the excommunication and deposition of the Queen by the Papal Bull, they evaded the question, and they had to suffer; but it was for treason. It is said that in the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign two hundred priests were put to death (no laymen suffered), whilst a still greater number perished in prison. But it is difficult to condemn the action of the Government, unless we would maintain the lawfulness of rebellion; since there is no reason to doubt the veracity of the ministers of Elizabeth when they declared that no

man in her reign suffered for his religion, and it is the deliberate judgment of Hallam, that any man in this reign might have saved his life by denying the Pope's power to depose the Queen; and Hume goes so far as to say that, making allowance for the prevailing prejudices of the times, the Queen's conduct in dealing with Roman Catholics could scarcely be accused of severity.

When Elizabeth died in 1603, Romanism and Puritanism were both at a very low ebb; and a continuance of the policy of the Queen and Whitgift might have resulted in consequences very different from the events of the future history of the Church. Those who valued the characteristic principles of Anglicanism must always feel that they owe a great debt to Elizabeth. We may speak of her coarseness, her profanity, her stinginess, and her vanity; but she had a sound English heart, she loved her people and desired their love, she toiled unremittingly for their good; and she seldom erred in her ends or even in the means by which she sought to bring them about.

CHAPTER XXIV.

RICHARD HOOKER.



THE great name of Richard Hooker demands a special attention from those who study the history and character of the Church of England. Both as a great example of English style and as an expounder of the principles of Anglicanism, he holds a place unique and supreme. As an English writer he has been placed beside Bacon who was seven years his junior. As a writer and thinker, he may be compared with Pascal; and it would be difficult to accord him higher honor.

Hooker was born at Heavitree near Exeter, in 1554 and died in 1600, only forty-six years of age. His family seems to have been of some importance; but his father was in poor circumstances. His progress at the Exeter Grammar School was so remarkable that his teacher got his uncle, John Hooker, to interest himself in his education. By the influence of this uncle, Richard became acquainted with Jewel, then Bishop of Salisbury; who got for him a Bible clerkship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. When Jewel died in 1571, Bishop Sandys, of London, interested himself in Hooker, and made him tutor to his son Edwin at Oxford. Hooker took his Bachelor's degree in January, 1574, and M. A.

in July 1577, in the same year obtaining a fellowship.

Although Hooker was essentially a theologian, he was widely read and deeply versed in many subjects. While at Oxford he was appointed deputy to the Professor of Hebrew. For some reason, he was driven from Oxford for a time, probably by the vice-president of his college, who was an extreme Puritan. But he returned to Oxford and took orders in 1581, and in the same year preached for the first time at Paul's Cross.

The story of Hooker's unfortunate marriage is well known. Mrs. Hooker has been not improperly compared to Xanthippe. Walton, in his classical life of Hooker, tells how, when his pupils Cranmer and Sandys came to visit him, they found him in a field reading the Odes of Horace while tending his sheep. But they were soon deprived of his "quiet company" by his wife coming and ordering him to rock the cradle. They were naturally shocked at the tyranny to which their revered tutor was subject, and took their leave. It has been said that the terms of Hooker's will, in which he makes Mrs. Hooker, whom he styles "my well-beloved wife" sole executrix and residuary legatee, prove that the marriage was not altogether an unhappy one; but the inference is far from certain.

It has already been told how Hooker was appointed preacher at the Temple (1585) at the time when the Puritan Travers, who had been destined for that post, was reader. It seemed a most undesirable state of things that the preacher should in the

morning promulgate teachings which were assailed by the reader in the afternoon. Yet it is to this circumstance that we owe Hooker's great work. "The pulpit," says Fuller, "spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon." Hooker was never a popular preacher and Travers seemed to get more of the public favor, and moreover at that time there was a large public sentiment favorable to Puritanism. Travers, being silenced by Whitgift, on the ground that he had only Presbyterian orders, appealed to the Council, and a controversy began between him and Hooker, conducted in a respectful manner on both sides. This led Hooker to a more careful study of the questions between them, and at his own request he was presented by the Archbishop to a country living, Boscombe in Wiltshire, where he might more peacefully prosecute his studies. Here he speedily completed the half of his work. In July, 1595, he was promoted to Bishopsbourne, near Canterbury, where he died and lies buried.

Both Walton and Fuller speak of Hooker's remarkable humility and simplicity. Walton says he was "of a mean stature and stooping, and yet more lowly in the thoughts of his soul; his body worn out not with age but study and holy mortifications;" and again he says he was of a mild and humble nature. But, as Keble remarks, "these qualities were by no means constitutional in him. Like Moses, to whom Walton compares him, he was by nature extremely sensitive, quick in feeling any sort of unfairness, and thoroughly aware of his own power to chastise it: so that his forbearance must

have been the result of strong principle and unwearied self-control." Walton, Keble thinks, was further mistaken in considering Hooker childishly ignorant of human nature and of the ordinary business of life; "whereas," he says, "his writings betray uncommon shrewdness and quickness of observation, and a vein of the keenest humor runs through them, the last quality we should look for, if we judged only by reading the *Life*."

The first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Policy* were published in 1593, the author stating that he thought it better to let these go forth by themselves rather than wait for the remainder. "Such generalities," he says, "as are here handled it will be perhaps not amiss to consider apart, as by way of introduction into the books that are to follow concerning particulars. In 1597 the fifth book appeared, somewhat longer than all the first four. No more appeared during Hooker's life. Some doubt remains as to the fate of the remaining three books; but it seems probable that they were destroyed by Mrs. Hooker at the suggestion of some Puritan friends who did not wish to perpetuate Hooker's influence against their own views. The sixth and eighth books were found among his papers; and afterwards the seventh. The last discovered is the most complete of the three; the sixth consisting of a set of notes on various subjects.

The first five books form a work of remarkable dignity and power; and illustrate the great capabilities of the noble language in which they are written. "His style," says Fuller, "was long and pithy,

driving on a whole flock of causes before he comes to the close of a sentence." In the words of Hallam, "Hooker not only opened the mine, but explored the depths of our native eloquence." The greatness of the work was recognized at once. Walton relates that when the first book was read to Pope Clement XII., he declared, "There is no learning that this man hath not searched into; nothing too hard for his understanding;" and gave orders that it should be translated into Latin.

The object of Hooker's work was to defend, on grounds of reason, the Anglican settlement of ecclesiastical government. The Puritans contended that every doctrine and institution should be derived from the Scriptures, and that any addition to these was wrong. Hooker, on the contrary, maintained that human conduct was to be guided by "all the sources of light and truth with which man finds himself encompassed." Natural law lies at the basis of all, embodies God's supreme reason, and appoints to the whole field of Nature the means by which it works out perfection in several parts. The principle set forth in the treatise was stated in the Sermon on Pride, one of the course condemned by Travers.

Speaking of the difference between moral and natural law on the one hand, and positive or mutable law on the other, Hooker says that the fact of this difference not being observed "hath not a little obscured justice. It is no small perplexity which this thing hath bred in the minds of many, who beholding the laws which God Himself hath given,

abrogated and disannulled by human authority, imagine that justice is hereby conculcated; that men take upon them to be wiser than God Himself; that unto their devices His ordinances are constrained to give place: which popular discourses, when they are polished with such art and cunning as some men's wits are well acquainted with, it is no hard matter with such tunes to enchant most religiously affected souls. The root of which error is a misconceit that all laws are positive which men establish, and all laws which God delivereth immutable. No, it is not the author which maketh, but the matter whereon they are made, that causeth laws to be thus distinguished." Here we have, as Keble remarks, the very rudiment and germ of that argument.

The heart of the whole controversy was the question of Church authority, the question with whom Church authority resides. On this point there were three great parties. The first was that of the Ultramontanes, who refused to the civil government any prerogative beyond that of executing what the Popes and Councils should decree. The second of those who maintained the claims of the local government against the Papacy, holding that Church laws and constitutions are left by Providence to the discretion of the civil power. Most of the early reformers adhered to this view. A third party had arisen during the period of the Reformation, who agreed with the Roman Catholics in acknowledging a Church authority independent of the State, but thought that it should be assigned to a mixed council of Presbyters lay and spiritual, who derived

their authority from the Scriptures. Hooker adhered to the second of these theories.

It would have seemed the simplest line to insist, as against the Puritans, that the bishops had their succession from the apostles and therefore had the same authority which belonged to them. This, however, was not the line taken by Jewel, Whitgift, and others. They appealed to Christian antiquity in regard to the doctrines which they confessed, in opposition to Roman or Puritan. But in regard to episcopacy they are content to show that the government by bishops is ancient and allowable. Such a position was taken partly out of consideration for the reformed churches on the Continent, and partly because they had not that knowledge of Christian antiquity which we now possess. For example, the writings of St. Ignatius, which are now on all hands recognized as of capital importance, had not yet been vindicated as genuine. The Anglican controversialists of that period were content to defend their own position by arguing that the Church having from the earliest times decided to be governed by bishops, it would not be right to depart from that government when it could be had in union with sound doctrine and the rights of the Chief Magistrate.

Hooker was very careful to assert this argument with great moderation. "For mine own part," he says, "although I see that certain reformed churches, the Scottish especially and the French, have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by bishops, . . . this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in

such case than exagitate, considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best." These remarks are admirable and in the spirit of the best of the Anglican reformers, who knew that several of the foreign reformed churches would gladly have retained the episcopal government, if that had been possible, but who yet regarded doctrinal truth as of more importance than apostolic government.

At the same time it must be observed, as Mr. Keble remarks, that Hooker's view does not represent the high water mark of Anglicanism. There is, he says, "a marked distinction between that which now perhaps we may venture to call the school of Hooker and that of Laud, Hammond, and Leslie." And Mr. Keble goes on: "He, as well as they, regarded the order of bishops as being immediately and properly of Divine right; he as well as they laid down principles which, strictly followed up, would make this claim exclusive. But he, in common with most of his contemporaries, shrunk from the legitimate result of his own premises, the rather, as the fulness of apostolic authority on this point had never come within his cognizance; whereas the next generation of divines entered on the subject, as was before observed, fresh from the study of St. Ignatius." It is possible that Keble pitches a little too high the point of view of Hooker, but the reader can judge of this for himself.

Another matter of controversy between Hooker and the Puritans related to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; but this need not here be entered upon.

We cannot, however, properly pass by that which related to the Sacraments. In the first place, as regards the Incarnation and our engrafting into Christ, Hooker repudiates the merely analogical interpretation. "It is too cold an interpretation," he says, "whereby some men expound our being in Christ to impart nothing else, but only that the self-same nature which maketh us to be men is in Him, and maketh Him man as we are. For what man in the world is there, which hath not so far forth communion with Jesus Christ? It is not this that can sustain the weight of such sentences as speak of the mystery of our coherence with Jesus Christ." Hooker evidently was not one of those who would banish the mystical from revelation and religion.

In the same way, he could not agree with those who regarded the sacraments merely as expressive actions, nor with those who failed to recognize the special grace connected with the Sacraments. He teaches explicitly that Baptism is the only ordinary means of regeneration, and the Eucharist the only ordinary means whereby Christ's body and blood can be taken and received. Concerning Baptism he says, "As we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God, but by new birth; nor, according to the manifest ordinary course of Divine dispensation newborn, but by that Baptism which both declareth and maketh us Christians." Concerning the two great Sacraments he says: "It is not ordinarily His will to bestow the grace of Sacraments on any, but by the Sacraments;" and he explains the words of our Lord in the sixth

chapter of St. John, concerning the eating of His flesh and drinking His blood, as referring to the Eucharist.

In regard to ceremonies, also, the tone of Hooker was widely different from that of many of the reformers, even of such men as Cranmer or Jewel, who sometimes speak with a certain impatience or even contempt of things which Hooker treats with respect or at least with tolerance. Nor was this, on his part, as some have suggested, a mere survival of traditional views. Hooker had been brought up under Puritan influences and had found his way to these convictions by a deep and independent study of the Scriptures and of Christian antiquity. In this way he contended for the lawfulness of the use of religious symbolism, on the ground that sensible things may have meanings beyond those which appear on the surface, may have spiritual and heavenly meanings the consideration of which may raise us up to the realization of things divine. Thus certain actions of the body, as bowing at the name of Jesus, and turning to the East in prayer; certain forms of matter, as the cross and the ring; such things having a certain intelligible meaning, might be almost necessary for children; and such things the Church "instinctively selected for her ceremonies, and combined them by degrees into an orderly system, varying as circumstances might require in different dioceses, but everywhere constituting a kind of perpetual sacrifice; offering to the Most Holy Trinity so many samples (if we may so call them) or specimens of our common hourly actions, and of the material objects in

which we are most conversant, as tithes are a sample and specimen of our whole property, and holy days of our whole time: likely therefore, as tithes and holy days are, by devout using to bring down a blessing on the whole.”¹

Thus he speaks of fasting as having distinct practical benefits; of the Lord's Day (not as the Sabbath) as resting on a mixed ground of ritual and of moral obligation; of Saints' Days as being in one sense determined by God's own voice, yet also by the authorized legislation of His Church. He has no sympathy with the rude indifference to all festivals but Sunday, or with the excessive pretension of regard for the Lord's Day. In all his judgments he was guided at once by considerations of religion, of ecclesiastical custom and authority, and of sanctified common sense. On one point he had no sympathy with some of the pretended reformers who were always ready to make gain by the robbery of the Church. In his view, whatever had been dedicated to God, whether land or house or treasure, was to be regarded as sacred and inalienable. To divert such property to secular purposes was, in his opinion, sacrilege; the same as though a clergyman should abandon his sacred calling and take the place of a layman again. Yet he would not apply this principle to the secularization of the revenues of the religious houses, since their goods might be regarded as partly of the nature of civil possessions such as are held by other kinds of corporations. Whatever, however, had been clearly dedicated to God could,

¹ Keble: Preface to the Eccles. Polity.

in his view, never cease to be His, but by His own cession.

In the same way Hooker attributed a real sanctity to consecrated places in opposition to the hard and rationalistic views of the Brownists. He also protested against the notion becoming prevalent that the sermon alone was the "quick and forcible word of God, to the disparagement of the Scriptures and forms of prayer, holding, as he did, that a Church was a place of solemn homage and service not only nor chiefly a place of religious instruction.

In regard to the relation between the Scriptures and the Church, he regarded the Church as a witness to the truth. According to the Reformation principle, firmly maintained by Hooker and all the great Anglican divines, Holy Scripture is paramount in regard to doctrine: reason and Church authority being only subsidiary, interpreting Scripture or deducing from it. In regard to rites and ceremonies, however, which form a kind of practical application of doctrine, apostolical traditions, which can be proved to be truly such, must be regarded as binding, just as if they were found in the writings of the Apostles. "For both being known to be apostolical, it is not the manner of delivering them unto the Church, but the author from whom they proceed, which doth give them their force and credit."

With regard to the Divine decrees, Hooker was certainly not Calvinistic or an adherent of the Lambeth Articles; but he was undoubtedly very near to what might be properly called Augustinianism; although even here he has safeguards quite in accord-

ance with his cautious, deep, and well-balanced judgment.

The influence which Hooker exerted on the Church of England is not to be estimated merely by the contents of his great work, and its position in the literature of the Anglican communion; but in the creation of a school of writers who looked to him as their master, who not only carried on the great tradition of his teaching, but who worked in a spirit of independent investigation, and rendered permanent the adhesion of the Anglican Reformation to the principles of Apostolical order as well as primitive truth. In this and in other ways the influence of this great scholar and thinker will never cease to be felt not merely in the Anglican Communion, but in all those denominations which spring from the same root and use the English language.¹

¹ Readers who may wish for a more complete estimate of Hooker's work should refer to Keble's Preface, and to the late Dean Church's Introduction to the first book of the Ecclesiastical Polity.

CHAPTER XXV.

KING JAMES I. AND ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.

WHEN it was known that King James of Scotland was to be the successor of Elizabeth, a very natural alarm took possession of English Churchmen, lest the Presbyterian King should throw all the weight of his influence on the side of Puritanism. As a matter of fact, however, James had become quite sick of Presbyterianism, not only because of its democratic and republican tendencies and sympathies, but also because of the despotism of its teachers. It was an immense relief to the religious leaders of the King's new subjects when they learned that he was well acquainted with their system and preferred it greatly to the Presbyterian discipline. The Puritans, however, were not without hope of gaining something in the new state of things: and the Church party looked forward with some apprehension to the meeting of Parliament.

Both parties addressed the King, the Puritans presenting a petition, signed by seven hundred and fifty of their ministers, in which they set forth their grievances, whilst the Universities replied in such a manner as to prejudice the King against the principles of the Puritans. An order was given to prepare for his Majesty a full statistical account of the state of the parishes and dioceses, including a

statement of the number of communicants, of recusants, of pluralists, the value of benefices, and the names of the patrons. Towards the end of the year the King addressed a letter to the bishops, declaring his intention of upholding the Church and enforcing the laws, but without shedding of blood. At the same time he intimated his intention of having a conference at which the dissidents should be allowed to state their grievances.

This is the origin of the "Hampton Court Conference," which was held in the palace of that name during three days in January, 1604. The King evidently cherished the hope of bringing about a reconciliation of the contending parties. In announcing, by proclamation, the meeting to be held "for the hearing and determining things pretended to be amiss in the Church," he gave it to be plainly understood that he was decidedly in favor of the existing state of things, although it was quite possible that time might have brought in "some corruptions which may deserve a review and amendment," and if such could be pointed out, the King said, he would take the regular method of setting them right by Parliament or Convocation.

It cannot be truly said that this conference reflected much credit upon the wisdom of the King, although it might not be fair to blame the Church. There were but four divines on the Puritan side, and unfortunately they were all nominated by the King. They were Drs. Reynolds and Sparkes, Mr. Chader-ton and Mr. Knewstubbs. On the Church side were nineteen, among them the venerable Primate; Ban-

croft the able but impetuous Bishop of London, soon to succeed Whitgift at Canterbury; Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, whom we have noticed as the asserter of the divine origin of episcopacy. There were also present Andrewes, then Dean of Westminster, a scholar, a theologian, a saintly and fervid preacher; Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, author of the part of the Catechism on the Sacraments; Field, afterwards Dean of Gloucester, author of the famous work "Of the Church," and others.

If the arrangements were bad, the conduct of the conference was, if possible, worse. On the first day only the King and bishops were present, so that an impression was produced that they were taking measures for crushing their opponents. On the other hand the King stated that he wished to satisfy himself on certain points before the conference began; and it must be remembered that his Presbyterian education may have rendered it necessary for him to acquaint himself with the doctrine and ritual of the English Church.

It appears that the King's conduct at this meeting was all that could be desired. James was a good scholar, having been taught as he frequently boasted, by one of the best writers of Latin since classical times, George Buchanan. He was also a man of considerable learning; and although he was often guilty of conduct which was childish, vulgar, and indecent, yet he was not without a good share of intelligence and common sense.¹ Barlow, Dean of

¹ In the opinion of the present writer Dean Hook's remarks are too severe. It would be difficult to give a truer picture of James I. than that by Walter Scott, in the "Fortunes of Nigel."

Chester, who reported the conference, declares: "We were dismissed after three hours and more spent; which were soon gone, so admirably both for understanding, and speech, and judgment did his Majesty handle all those points, sending us away not with contentment only, but with astonishment." Here, we may remark, is a specimen of the flattery, often more gross, which King James received from even higher ecclesiastics and in which he greatly delighted. If we are inclined to criticise such utterances, we may remember the customs of that age, and the surprised delight of the Church party at finding their not unreasonable fears dispelled. There is, at least, no reason for doubting their sincerity. Even the magnificent dedication of the authorized version of the Bible is not without such features which to us must seem blemishes.

At the first meeting the chief points discussed were private baptism, confirmation, and absolution. In regard to the last it was agreed that "remission of sins" should be introduced before the general absolution; it was to be made clear that confirmation was no part of the Sacrament of Baptism; and further, it was decided that, instead of sanctioning the baptism of sick children by nurses, a curate or lawful minister should be called in. This last point was a concession to the frequent contention of the Puritans on this point. Bancroft brought forward ancient authorities in favor of lay baptism; but the King was strong on the other side and the majority of the bishops went with him.

This preliminary meeting was held on Saturday,

January 14, and on the following Monday, both parties assembled before the King who said he was ready to hear what the four dissidents had to urge, remarking that he understood them to be among the most learned and reasonable of their party. Bancroft began by protesting against the hearing of schismatics, apparently forgetting how the tables might have been turned upon himself. The King, however, told Dr. Reynolds to go on. The Puritans made their objections first to doctrines, insisting upon the teaching of the Lambeth Articles and the insufficiency of the Thirty-nine on Predestination and the like. Then they objected to the reading of the Apocrypha and to the rigidity of subscription. In regard to Church government they took a line which brought down the wrath of his Majesty upon them. "If you aim at a Scotch Presbytery," he exclaimed, "it agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom and Will and Dick will meet and censure me and my council." As regards ritual, they objected to the cross in baptism, to the surplice, to certain ceremonies in the marriage service, for example, the giving of a ring, and to the churching of women. All resented the objection to the cross, the King declaring that he would not tolerate such weak brethren. When one of the Puritans spoke of the surplice being a garment worn by the priests of Isis, the King retorted that he had been accustomed to hear it spoken of as "a rag of Popery." On the whole, there is little doubt of the truth of Neal's statement that the "Puritan ministers were insulted, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn,

without either wit or good manners." Even if to us many of the Puritan objections may seem absurd, and have been given up by their successors, yet they had been promised a hearing, and they ought to have got what they were promised.

On the third day, Wednesday (January 18), the Archbishop and committee presented their report, suggesting the alterations already noticed. They were very few; and the Puritans, who had been flattering themselves that they had the best of the arguments, were told by the King that the exceptions taken were matters of weakness. Dr. Reynolds he counselled to obedience and humility, such as he expected from honest and good men; and Reynolds afterwards conformed. In answer to intercessions on behalf of some ministers in Lancashire and Suffolk, the King gave for answer: "Let them conform themselves, or they shall hear of it." Commissioners were appointed to give effect to the changes agreed upon; and they were published in letters patent, by which the exclusive use of the revised Prayer Book was ordered.

The changes made by the conference were promulgated by the King under the clause in Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity which empowered the sovereign, with the advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to ordain further ceremonies, if the orders of the Book of Common Prayer should be misused. These alterations, however, had also the sanction of Convocation, inasmuch as that body ordered the revised book to be provided for the use of parish churches.

The changes made were (1) the removal of several Apocryphal first lessons and the substitution of others from the canonical Scriptures; (2) the introduction, already mentioned, of the phrase "or remission of sins," into the title of the general absolution; (3) a prayer for the Queen, the Prince and other children of the King, introduced after the prayer for the King; and a corresponding petition in the litany; (4) thanksgiving for particular occasions; for rain, for fair weather, for plenty, for peace and victory, and for deliverance from the plague. The chief alteration was made in the rubrics of the office for private baptism, restricting the administration to the minister of the parish or some other lawful minister. The concluding portion of the catechism, on the sacraments, written by Dean Overall, was now added.

Whitgift was now seventy-three years of age, and soon after the Hampton Court Conference, he took cold in his barge on the Thames, and other complications ensued. He was stricken with paralysis, and, when the King went to see him, he attempted to converse with him in Latin. All that could be caught of his utterances were the words: "*Pro Ecclesia Dei.*" He died February 20, 1604. Whitgift was a man of high principle, simple-minded, sincere, and disinterested. He was loyal to the principles of the Church of England and courted favor neither with the powerful nor with the multitude. Those who have ventured to condemn him for his strictness would have been the first to find fault with him for inconsistency, if he had acted differ-

ently. It cannot be doubted that the Church of England owes him a great debt of gratitude; and those who value the constitution of that Church will regard Whitgift as one of the foremost of those who have labored wisely and self-denyingly for the maintenance of her principles. It should be added that the sermons which Whitgift left, although now seldom read, do not deserve the neglect into which they have fallen, being, both in matter and in form, eminently worthy of study.

During the vacancy of the Primacy, the Convocation of Canterbury met, March 20, 1604, under the presidency of Bancroft, Bishop of London. At the fifth session (April 13) the King's licence to make canons was shown. On May 18, the Thirty-nine Articles were again approved and subscribed. In the eleventh session Bancroft brought in a book of canons, consisting of various articles, injunctions, and synodal acts passed in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and placed the book in the hands of the Prolocutor of the Lower House. Before these canons were adopted a discussion arose with the Puritans on the use of the cross in baptism, the effect of which will be seen in the thirtieth canon. The rest of the canons seem to have passed without much opposition. These canons do not touch the laity except so far as they represent earlier parliamentary legislation, or have subsequently received legislative sanction; but they certainly bind the Clergy, and may be enforced by ecclesiastical penalties.

It is of importance to understand the general effect of these canons, and therefore we will here

give their principal contents. They are one hundred and sixty-one in number, and are divided into thirteen chapters. The first chapter declares that whoever should maintain that the Church of England was not a true and apostolical church, should be *ipso facto* excommunicated, and not be restored until he had made a public revocation of his wicked error. Chapter II., on Divine Worship, in like manner, condemned those who disparaged the Book of Common Prayer. Due reverence is required during divine service. At the name of Jesus lowly reverence is to be made. Holy communion is to be received three times a year at least; and in all cathedral and collegiate churches, on the principal feast days, the celebrant is to use a decent cope, and to be assisted by a Gospeller and Epistoler agreeably, according to the advertisements published in the seventh year of Elizabeth.

When these canons were passed by the Synod of Canterbury, the King, by letters patent, made them binding upon the whole kingdom. This seemed to the Convocation of York an infringement of their independence; so that they petitioned to be allowed to make canons for themselves; and, this permission having been obtained, they adopted the canons previously passed by the Convocation of Canterbury. On July 16 a proclamation went forth, warning all to be ready to conform before the last day of November, or to take the consequences.

On the 9th of October, 1604, Bancroft was nominated to the primacy and on the 15th of December he was confirmed in Lambeth Church. It is believed

that he was chosen in pursuance of the resolve now formed to apply the ecclesiastical law more strictly. Bancroft was born in Lancashire in 1544, the son of a gentleman of private means. He was educated at Cambridge, but was not made a fellow of his college, although he became eminent as a tutor. Soon after his ordination he became chaplain to Bishop Cox of Ely; and on account of his reputation for eloquence, he was made University preacher in 1576. In 1584 he was made rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and in the following year he took his degree of D. D., and was made treasurer of St. Paul's Cathedral by the Queen. His promotions now became rapid. In 1589 he was made a Prebendary of St. Paul's, in 1592, Canon of Westminster Abbey, and in 1594 Canon of Canterbury. Bancroft showed himself an adversary of the Puritans, especially in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, which attracted a great deal of attention. It was in this sermon that he set forth the doctrine of the divine right of episcopacy, as already mentioned. Bancroft was recommended by Whitgift to the Queen; but it was sometime before his conspicuous merits received adequate recognition. At last, in 1597, through the influence of Whitgift and Cecil, he was nominated to the See of London; and in 1604 he succeeded Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury.

It was not long before Bancroft began to show that more vigorous methods were to be taken with recusants. It is believed that he stirred up the Council to intimate to the archbishops that, where advice and admonition were ineffectual, obedience

should be compelled. On the 22d of December, copies of this letter were forwarded to all the suffragans of Canterbury. In carrying out the commands of the Council they were to follow that which was enjoined in the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh canons of the last Convocation.

By these canons it is required that no one shall be allowed to hold a living or preach or catechise without a licence from a bishop or one of the Universities; and then only on condition of signing Whitgift's three articles. But, beyond the signature required up to this time, every one subscribing these articles had to set down both his Christian and surname, and declare that he did "willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to these three articles." Without discussing the question how far, in the circumstances of the time, such a measure might be justified, we must admit that there was a hardship in pressing tender consciences too far; and some of the men who have been the soundest in their allegiance to the English Church have condemned these measures as harsh and mischievous. Not only were many of the Puritans driven into nonconformity and exile; but many laymen were alienated from the established form of religion. At the same time there was a widespread appearance of conformity; and some have thought that, if Bancroft had lived longer "he would quickly have extinguished all that fire in England which had been kindled at Geneva."

There may, however, be some doubt as to whether Bancroft's action was altogether defensible, since he came into collision with the common law courts, the

judges of which granted prohibitions, by which the cases were removed from the ecclesiastical courts to be tried by the common law of the land. It is unnecessary to go into details further than to say that the bishops protested and the matter was brought before the King. The Archbishop argued that, since the judges were the King's delegates, his Majesty had the power of taking any case out of their hands. Sir Edward Coke, the Chief Justice, on the contrary, maintained that the common law judges alone had the power of interpreting the law, and that the ecclesiastical courts had no right to fine or imprison except for heresy. The King was not able to settle the dispute, and exhorted them to live in peace. It can easily be understood that these disagreements increased the jealousy of the laity, ever watchful against the encroachments of the ecclesiastics; and the fact that the Clergy seemed always ready to support the King in his absolutist tendencies, and that they seemed able to count upon royal support of their own aggressions, produced a state of feeling in Parliament and among the laity which resulted in the antagonism of the nation at large to the King's unfortunate son, Charles I.

Only a brief notice need here be given to the serious incident known as the "Gunpowder Plot." It is impossible either to charge Roman Catholics in general with this conspiracy, or to acquit particular members of their body of the attempt to destroy the King and his two sons. The author of this attempt was Robert Catesby, a Roman Catholic gentleman who had suffered persecution. The agent selected

was a soldier named Guy Fawkes. It is well known that the anxiety of one of the conspirators to save the life of a friend led to the discovery of the plot. Guy Fawkes was taken just as he was about to fire the train. The conspirators who were taken were executed; and the only result was an increased ardor in the persecution of Roman Catholics.

One of the most important works accomplished during the primacy was the revision of the English Bible which resulted in the authorized version; not published, however, until the year after Bancroft's death. During the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth two versions of the Bible were in common use, the Genevan Bible, produced under the influence of Calvin; and the Bishops' Bible, under the superintendence of Archbishop Parker. The Genevan New Testament was published in 1557, and the whole Bible in 1560, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. The book became popular at once, both on account of its convenient size, so much more handy than the Great Bible; and because of the improved character of the translation. The Calvinistic bias by which it is distinguished probably increased its popularity. The Bishops' Bible was undertaken by Parker, in order to provide a version better suited to the needs of English Churchmen. After surmounting many difficulties the Bishops' Bible was published in 1568 in a handsome folio. The names of the revisers are not certainly known; for although initials are added at the end of some of the books, some names are known to be omitted. Among those who are known, eight were bishops, including

Sandys, Guest, Cox, and others; whence the book derived its name. Parker asked for the royal sanction on the ground that, whilst the Genevan version was unsatisfactory, the accuracy of the Great Bible could not be maintained. Whether the Queen gave any reply to this application we cannot tell; but at least the new translation was sanctioned by Convocation. By degrees the Great Bible fell out of use, and the Bishops' Bible and the Genevan both held their place in the public services. It should be added that the Roman Catholic version appeared soon afterwards, the Rheims New Testament being published in 1582, and the Douai Old Testament in 1609.

The subject of a new translation of the Bible was brought up at the Hampton Court Conference; and the King, as we are informed by Bancroft, "wished some special pains should be taken" for one uniform translation, and "he gave this caveat, upon a word cast out by my Lord of London, that no marginal notes should be added, having found in them which are annexed to the Geneva translation. . . some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and savoring too much of traitorous and dangerous conceits."

On the 22d of July (1604) the King wrote to Bancroft, not yet translated to the See of Canterbury which was then vacant, saying that he had "appointed certain learned men to the number of four and fifty, for the translating of the Bible," asking him to recompense the translators by Church preferment, and giving instructions for the carrying out of the work. The preliminaries were arranged in this

year; but the work of revision does not seem to have been seriously begun until 1607. Forty-seven revisers are named. Among those who took part in it mention may be made of Andrewes, Dean of Westminster, afterwards Bishop of Winchester; Overall, Dean of St. Paul's; Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College; Savile, Provost of Eton; whilst others of less repute were also men of learning and distinction.

The revisers were the men of that time who were the best fitted for the work; but they were required to act under certain rules prescribed for their guidance. Thus they were instructed to follow the Bishops' Bible which was to be "as little altered as the truth of the original will permit." The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept, e. g., the word "Church" instead of "Congregation" (as in the Geneva Bible). No marginal notes were to be affixed, except for the explanation of Hebrew or Greek words. When a company had finished a book, they were required to "send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously, for his Majesty is very careful in this point." There were fifteen rules in all: these are the most important, and may serve as samples of the whole.

In the preface to the new translation, now not often printed in our Bibles, Dr. Miles Smith, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, representing the body of translators, declares: "The work hath not been huddled up in seventy-two days [like the Septuagint], but hath cost the workmen, as light as it seemeth, the pains of twice seven times seventy-two

days and more. . . We were so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before in this kind, either in this land or beyond sea, . . . that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of His Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance." Still he goes on, it is well that the earlier versions should be subjected to further consideration, since by this means "it cometh to pass that whatsoever is sound already . . . the same will shine as gold, more brightly being rubbed and polished; also if any thing be halting or superfluous or not so agreeable to the original, the same may be corrected and the truth set in place." Speaking of the revisers, he says, "there were many chosen that were greater in other men's eyes than in their own, and that sought the truth rather than their own praise. . . . Neither did we disdain to revise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anvil that which we had hammered; but having and using as great helps as were needful, and fearing no reproach for slowness, nor coveting praise for expedition, we have at the length, through the good hand of the Lord upon us, brought the work to that pass that you see."

The revised version appeared in 1611 and won its way to public favor very slowly. The same kind of attack was made upon it as that with which we are familiar in the case of the revised version of our own day, the revisers being accused of defective scholarship, of unnecessary alterations from the earlier translations, and even of false doctrine. "It was

not till about the middle of the century that [the Geneva Bible] was formally displaced. And thus, at the very time when the monarchy and the Church were, as it seemed, finally overthrown, the English people, by their silent and unanimous acceptance of the new Bible gave a spontaneous testimony to the principles of order and catholicity of which both were an embodiment.”¹ Of the greatness of the work thus accomplished it is unnecessary to speak. Whether we consider the simple dignity of the diction, or the improvements made in the renderings of the original documents, or the influence exerted upon the subsequent history of the English language, the authorized version of 1611 will always be an object of wonder and delight. It is only when finality is claimed for it, and the researches of scholars for nearly three centuries are set at nought, that a protest against contentions so preposterous becomes a duty in the interest of truth. It should be added that there is no evidence of the version of 1611 having been authorized by King or Parliament or Convocation; so that it gained its place of preëminence and exclusive right on the mere strength of its merits.

Another incident of no small importance, which took place under the primacy of Bancroft, was the reintroduction of episcopacy into Scotland, a change which has been commonly, but improperly, attributed to Laud. It was James himself who resolved to turn the pseudo-episcopal Scottish system into a re-

¹ Bp. Westcott: “History of the English Bible,” a work to which the reader may be confidently referred for further details on the subject of the English Versions.

ality. The Scottish reformation had been made on the Swiss model, Calvinistic and Presbyterian. In 1572 the nobles obtained the appointment of nominal bishops, known as the Tulchan¹ bishops, who received the incomes of their sees, and handed them over to their patrons. At the same time that these so-called bishops presided over their dioceses, the Presbyterians held their own assemblies, so that the King was called to arbitrate between them. In 1592 he reluctantly gave his consent to the reëstablishment of the Presbyterian system. But he soon repented. We have heard his utterance on Presbyterianism at the Hampton Court Conference; and we cannot greatly wonder at his feelings, when we remember the liberties taken with his Majesty by some of the Presbyterian leaders. They not only criticised his actions from the pulpit; but one of them plucked him by the sleeve, and called him, "God's silly vassal." Bishops were reappointed in 1599.

But it was in 1610 that a more serious step was taken by the consecration of Spotswood to Glasgow, Lamb to Brechin, and Hamilton to Galloway. In order to avoid offence to the Scottish Clergy, neither of the English archbishops took part in the consecration which was effected in the chapel of London House, October 21, 1610, by the bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester. Undoubtedly this was chiefly the work of James himself who held the

¹ Tulchan was the Scotch name for a calf's skin, stuffed with straw, which was set up by the side of a cow, so that she might give her milk more freely.

theory, "No bishop, no King;" but although he was resolved on this point, he knew his fellow-countrymen too well to insist upon the immediate introduction of the Anglican Prayer Book into the churches. When he was asked by Laud to draw his Scottish subjects "to a nearer conjunction with the liturgy and canons of this nation," the King said: "I sent him back with the frivolous draft he had drawn. For all that he feared not my anger, but assaulted me again with another ill-fangled platform to make that stubborn Kirk stoop more to the English platform; but I durst not play fast and loose with my word. He knows not the stomach of that people." What happened in this matter at a later period we shall see in due course.

Shortly after the consecration of the Scottish bishops Bancroft was taken ill, and died November 2, 1610, after being six years Archbishop. The strength and weakness of his administration will be judged differently by different men. On the one hand his work has been denounced as inquisitorial; on the other hand it has been urged that his severity was exhibited only towards those who had solemnly engaged to observe the laws of the Church, and were doing their utmost to evade their engagements. It has also been said that his plans did not succeed, and that he probably left the Church of England weaker than he found it; but it may not unfairly be urged in reply that he had scarcely time to give effect to his measures.

Two things have been charged against him which do not seem capable of proof, a too great severity in the High Commission Court and a spirit of parsi-

mony. But Bishop Hackett declares that, although he would chide stoutly, he would censure mildly; that he sat in the court rather as a father than as a judge; and that he regarded a pastoral staff as being made to bring back a wandering sheep, not to knock it down. As regards the charge of covetousness, it would appear that the Archbishop was parsimonious to no one but himself. He did not keep up the same state as his predecessors, but he left no more than six thousand pounds behind him; and he was always ready to help the needy.

CHAPTER XXVI.

ARCHBISHOP ABBOT AND CALVINISM.



WHEN Bancroft died, it was hoped by many that he would be succeeded by Andrewes whose claims were supported by Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham. He was also a favorite of the King, who had made him Bishop of Chichester (1605) and of Ely (1609). But there were several reasons for the selection of Abbot. In the first place, he had been employed in arranging the restoration of bishops to the Scottish Church and had conducted that work with success; and he was chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar, who was a favorite of the King. Moreover, he had written a preface to a book on the Gowrie conspiracy, in which he had spoken of the King as being "zealous as David, learned as Solomon, religious as Josias, careful of spreading the truth as Constantine, just as Moses, undefiled as Jehoshaphat or Hezekia, clement as Theodosius." From what we know of James, we should suppose he would find it difficult to withstand such arguments. In any case he made Abbot Archbishop.

Abbot was born at Guildford, in 1562, took his degree at Oxford, from Balliol college, in 1582, and became a fellow. In 1585 he received holy orders and soon acquired a great reputation as a preacher. In

1597 he became D. D., and was elected Master of University College. In 1599 he was made Dean of Winchester. In 1608 he became chaplain to the Earl of Dunbar, treasurer of Scotland. He was made Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in 1609, and of London in 1610. Abbot was a man of ability and sincerely religious, but he was intolerant and narrow-minded. He had been one of the great upholders of Puritanism in Oxford, having learned his theology from the foreign reformers; and he became engaged in controversy with Laud on the subjects of Arminianism, baptismal regeneration, and apostolical succession. In March 1611, he was nominated to Canterbury.

The appointment can hardly be regarded as other than unfortunate. It was acceptable to neither party in the Church at the time, and his administration was in no way advantageous to the Church. The King, from his friendship with the Prince of Orange, had become favorable to the Calvinists and opposed to the Remonstrants or Arminians; and Henry, Prince of Wales was on the same side. He was spoken of as the "darling of the Puritans," and he had declared that, when he came to the throne, he would take means of reconciling the Puritans to the Church; but his early death put an end to their hopes (November 6, 1612).

Under the influence of Abbot religious persecution was revived in a very hideous form. During the reign of Elizabeth a good many had been put to death, but none for forty years simply on the ground of heresy, but because they were guilty of treason.

But now the fires of Smithfield were lighted again for the burning of heretics. The first to suffer was Bartholomew Legget, an Essex man, about forty years of age. This man had imbibed Arian opinions and was well read in the Scriptures and full of confidence in the opinions which he professed to have discovered in them. He was cited before the King who, proud of his learning as a theologian, took in hand to convince him of his errors. But, instead of yielding to his royal antagonist, he is said to have behaved with the greatest audacity, so that the King, in his anger, actually spurned him with his foot. He was then sent for trial to the Consistorial Court, where he was equally defiant, denying the authority of the court, and treating the judges with contempt. The court declared the accused to be worthy of death; but they had no power to sentence him, and, when he was brought before the civil court, care was taken to select judges who would condemn the heretic to death. It is shocking to add that Abbot was one of the foremost in getting the unfortunate man sentenced. Writing to the Lord Chancellor, he tells him that his Majesty's pleasure was that "your Lordship should call unto you three or four of the judges and take their resolution concerning the force of law in that behalf, that so with expedition these evil persons may receive the recompense of their pride and impiety. . . And, as I conceived, his Highness did not much desire that Lord Coke should be called thereunto, lest by his singularity in opinion he should give stay to the business." Coke had not much taste for giving effect to the

sentences of ecclesiastical courts; and it would be well that he should not be allowed to meddle! Bartholomew Legget was burned in Smithfield, March 18, 1612.

A second heretic who suffered the same penalty was Edward Wightman, who was burned at Lichfield soon after, April 11. But public horror and indignation were stirred at the "novelty and hideousness of the punishment;" and the King resolved that, in the case of any others condemned to death, they should be allowed to waste away in prison.

So long as the Archbishop seconded the wishes of the King, the court was ready to favor him; but narrow and one-sided as Abbot was, he was also high-minded and conscientious; and this was shown in two remarkable cases. The first was the case of the attempted alienation of the bequest of Thomas Sutton of Knaith in Lincolnshire, for the founding of the Charter House. Abbot's protest was successful, and with equal modesty and wisdom he gave the credit to the King.

The other was the divorce of the Countess of Essex, in order to permit of her union with James's favorite, Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset. A court was formed, consisting of four bishops and five civilians. The Archbishop and Bishop King of London were on the commission, and entreated the King not to persevere in his purpose. Such an appeal was vain. The two bishops nobly held out; but James issued a new commission and obtained the divorce, the tragic consequences of which probably convinced the King of the wrong he had done.

Throughout his whole reign James maintained his royal supremacy over the law itself; and any one who resisted his arbitrary authority had to yield or to suffer. On one occasion he summoned the judges and informed them that they must abstain from trying any case in which the prerogative of the crown was involved. All the judges promised obedience, except the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Edward Coke, who declared that whatever case might come before him should be dealt with according to law. In consequence he was first suspended and afterwards dismissed.

In the year 1618 the King published his famous "Book of Sports" in which he enjoined certain amusements as suited for Sunday afternoons, namely, dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, May-games, Morris-dances, and the like. It is said that the publication of this book was occasioned by the inconvenient strictness of Puritan Sabbatarianism which he had met with in a progress through Lancashire. The book produced a very painful sensation among the Puritans; and the Archbishop forbade the reading of the King's letter in his Church at Croydon. But Mr. Trask, a Puritan minister, went further, and in reply, wrote a book upholding the strictest Sabbatarian observances. For this offence he was set in the pillory at Westminster, then whipped to the Fleet, and there confined during his Majesty's pleasure.

King James's passion for theology and Calvinism induced him to send deputies to the Synod of Dort, (1618), one of those sent being a man so distin-

guished as Dr. Joseph Hall, then Dean of Worcester, who preached the sermon at the opening of the assembly and received a gold medal from the synod in token of respect. But James's zeal for Calvinism began to abate. He was now contemplating a marriage between Prince Charles and the Infanta of Spain, so that it became necessary to relax the laws against Romanism; and this again threw the Archbishop more into the hands of the Puritans.

While the influence of Abbot was waning, one whom most men had destined for his place, Lancelot Andrewes, now Bishop of Winchester, became a leading man. But one whose name is almost forgotten by ourselves occupied a still more prominent place in the affairs of that time. This was the Dean of Westminster, John Williams, who had managed, by courtier-like manners and real ability, to get considerable influence with the Duke of Buckingham and so with the King. When Lord Bacon had to resign the Great Seal, it was given to Williams; and he showed himself not unequal to the great post. He shortly became Bishop of Lincoln, and obtained great influence in the making of ecclesiastical appointments. Among others whom he recommended for promotion was William Laud, then Dean of Gloucester.

The King had no liking for Laud. He had given him advice on the occasion of the introduction of the episcopate into the Scottish Church, which James regarded as unwise. As Dean of Gloucester, he had instituted reforms of a somewhat throughgoing character, removing the altar to the east end of the choir,

and making other changes which we should, in these days, think a matter of course, but which brought him into collision with the bishop. At length, however, King James nominated Laud to the Bishopric of St. David's.

The King's change of attitude was not approved by Parliament; and the Commons ventured on an earnest protest which the King received by tearing, with his own hand, from the Journal of their House the record of their protest. The Judges were immediately instructed to extend a pardon to all who were imprisoned for recusancy in religion alone. A number of Roman Catholics were in consequence released, and the Puritans were greatly inflamed.

But there was a danger from the pulpits, consequently order was given that the preachers should confine themselves to the subjects of the Thirty-nine Articles. Moreover, they were forbidden, unless a bishop or a dean, to preach on predestination or election. Neal did not misrepresent the state of the case, when, referring to the Synod of Dort, he said: "The King had assisted in maintaining these doctrines in Holland, but will not have them propagated in England. From this time all Calvinists were, in a manner, excluded from court preferments." These instructions were much complained of, especially where they were enforced by the bishops.

At the same time the suspicions of the whole country were being aroused, and Abbot thought it his duty to address an earnest remonstrance to the King, with special reference to the expedition of Prince Charles and Buckingham to Spain. The

alarm was allayed, however, by the return of the Prince and the intelligence that the match had been broken off.

The Parliament was still Calvinist and began to interpose with the view of putting down the spreading Arminianism. The first person assailed was Richard Montagu, a royal chaplain, who, in a controversy with some Jesuits who were attempting to make proselytes in his parish, had maintained that certain theories which the Jesuits had quoted as doctrines of the Church of England, were merely Puritan opinions. He was answered by two Puritan lecturers, who made extracts from his book and petitioned Parliament to deal with them. The Archbishop was requested to look into the matter, and he condemned the statements of Montagu. Laud and others recommended Montagu to appeal from this censure to the King. This appeal was afterwards heard, but not by James I. He died May 27, 1625.

If it cannot be denied that King James was sincerely attached to the Church of England, it is equally certain that his policy was injurious to her best interests, especially by his leading the Church, in large measure, to acknowledge his absurd and unhistorical autocratic claims. By that means the friends of liberty were driven into the Puritan camp, in consequence of which great danger resulted to the Crown, the Church, and the Nation.

CHAPTER XXVII.

KING CHARLES I. AND ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

HE remarks on the policy of King James must be applied with increased emphasis to that of his son. Of the personal excellences of Charles I. there can be no question; and there can be as little as to the folly of his conduct of affairs in Church and State; and he could hardly have had a counsellor who would have been a less safe guide for a man like himself than William Laud. It was evident, from the beginning of his reign, that Laud and not Abbot was to be the real leader of the Church of England.

Abbot anticipated the change which immediately took place. It was to Laud that Charles turned for information and guidance; and the marriage of the young king to Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV., of France, only made the separation from the Puritan bishop more complete. It was now certain that more tolerance would be granted to Rome than to Geneva. Nor could the most flexible of Protestants view with satisfaction the inauguration of Charles's reign and married life, when the young Frenchwoman was forbidden by her religious directors to take part in the sacred rite of Coronation, but thought it not unseemly to survey the ceremonial from a chamber in the palace yard amid circumstances of levity and frivolity.

The preparations for the Coronation in Westminster Abbey were made by Laud, who was one of the Prebendaries, as Williams, the Dean, was then in disgrace. Although some of the ceremonies were afterwards charged against Laud, it does not appear that Abbot, who administered the oath and performed the Act of Coronation, objected to any of them. The ceremonies were the same as were used both before and after the Reformation; and the crucifix which was placed on the altar was found among the regalia.

It was natural enough that Abbot should be made painfully conscious of his loss of importance and influence; but it was unfortunate that he should resent the fact by rudeness to Laud, which, it is said, he took every opportunity of exhibiting. Laud, who was nearly fifty-two years of age at the time of King James's death, seems to have behaved with great forbearance and self-control. When Abbot passed away, at the age of seventy-two (August 4, 1633), he was hardly missed, except that a cause of friction was removed; nor can it be said that he was much regretted by his own party. To a man of this kind it is not quite easy to do justice. He was a good man, a conscientious man who would not be turned from his own convictions of duty; but he was narrow, strict, and austere. It was his misfortune that he was called to the highest place in the Church. Some of the closing incidents of his primacy will be better understood in connection with the work of his successor, Archbishop Laud.

William Laud was born at Reading, October 7,

1573. In 1590 he became a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and in 1593, a fellow. He was ordained in 1601; and in 1605 he was induced to perform an act which he never ceased to regret, the marriage of the Earl of Devonshire to the divorced Lady Rich. In 1611 he became president of St. John's College, and speedily came into collision with the Calvinistic Puritanism which was prevalent in the University, upholding with great vigor the continuity of the Church from the beginning, in opposition to the extreme Protestants who were content to be members of a modern sect, and, along with this, setting forth the apostolical succession and the divine right of episcopacy.

In 1616 he became Dean of Gloucester; and to his work there, which was done with the approval of the King and to the advantage of the Church, reference has already been made. In 1621, with some misgivings, King James made him Bishop of St. David's. It was soon after this (in 1622) that Laud had a controversy with Fisher, the Jesuit. His contribution to this subject is of real value, and is a clear proof of the injustice of the charge brought against him that he was favorable to the Church of Rome. To those who refuse to submit to any authority which cannot base itself upon the letter of Scripture, not only Laud but Hooker, and many others, will be regarded as Romanizers; but Laud found, in the principles which he recognized as primitive and catholic, a defence at once against the tyranny of Romanism and the dogmatism of Puritanism.

Laud meant to be catholic and comprehensive. "The wisdom of the Church," he said, "hath been in all ages, or the most, to require consent to articles in general as much as may be, because that is the way of unity; and the Church in high points requiring assent to particulars, hath been rent." Yet he did not find it easy to carry these principles into practice. If he could have induced men to shut out from their speculations those points which he deemed unnecessary, things might have gone better; but he had no great width of view, and he was a strict disciplinarian without much sympathy with the freedom begotten of enthusiasm.

The gulph by which he was separated from the ordinary Puritan is illustrated by Laud's admiration for Aristotle. According to the Puritan, all good was the result of a continuous inspiration from above. Laud would not have denied this; but he attached an importance to the formation of habits and the services of the Church which the Puritan regarded as legal and unevangelical. As habits are formed by actions, so the habit of religion and piety is formed by religious actions. For this reason he took in hand to order divine service with greater care and reverence. "I labored nothing more," he says, "than that the external worship of God (too much slighted in most parts of this kingdom) might be preserved, and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be, being still of opinion, that unity cannot long continue in the Church, when uniformity is shut out at the church doors. And I evidently saw that the public neglect of God's service in the

outward face of it, and the nasty lying of many places dedicated to that service, had almost cast a damp upon the true and inward worship of God, which, while we live in the body, needs external helps, and all little enough to keep it in any vigor." Here are Laud's principles which he never failed to enforce—if too rigidly and with too little regard to the circumstances and difficulties of his times, yet with absolute sincerity and devotion.

It should be mentioned that it was through his controversy with Fisher, undertaken in the hope, which proved vain, of preventing the secession of the Duke of Buckingham's mother to Rome, that he obtained a considerable influence over the Duke though whom he first obtained favor with King James and Prince Charles.

It was through the influence of Williams, Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Lincoln, that Laud had been promoted to St. David's. Williams's friends say that his influence was exerted in behalf of Laud out of friendship for him: others declare that it was to get Laud out of the way, so that he might not be appointed Dean of Westminster. The neighbors of Williams had no great belief in his disinterestedness; and, although he managed to creep up into the highest place in the Church but one, this was attributed to his policy rather than his merits.

Williams and Laud had never much in common; and they drifted further apart. When Prince Charles and Buckingham went to Spain, Laud had no responsibility in connection with that expedition; but

Buckingham had asked him to look after his interests in his absence. When he found that Williams was fomenting the popular discontent in regard to the Spanish marriage, and throwing the blame of it upon the Duke of Buckingham, to whom he owed his own elevation, Laud felt bound to inform the Duke of what was going on. As a result there was a rupture between Buckingham and Williams, and so between Williams and Laud. Soon after the accession of Charles, Williams was deprived of his office of Lord Keeper, apparently through the influence of Buckingham.

Reference has already been made to the attack made on Richard Montagu, his condemnation by Abbot, and his appeal to the King in his book entitled *Appello Cæsarem*. The House of Commons appointed a committee to examine into the doctrinal character of the book. As a result the opinion of the House was given, that "he was guilty of an offence against the state, and so to be presented to the Lords." Upon this the King interposed for the protection of his chaplain; and Montagu was defended by Bishops Laud, Houson, and Buckeridge, who declared that his teaching was in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England. Parliament was dissolved, so that no further steps could be taken in the matter.

Charles determined to make use of the Clergy for the propagation of his absolutist theories of government. The "tuning of the pulpits" had been used by Queen Elizabeth; and, although the influence of the Clergy had greatly declined, the King thought

he might still, in this manner, advance his cause. Consequently sermons were preached and published, setting forth the power of the prince to make laws *jure divino*, and also to impose taxes. One of these sermons was preached by Dr. Sibthorp at the Assizes in Northampton. Abbot was asked to licence it, and refused, whereupon he was practically suspended, being commanded to remain in his house. The sermon was licenced by Bishop Mountain of London (May 8, 1627). Several other sermons of the same kind were preached and published. By this means the public feeling against the Clergy was very much embittered.

Again the attack of Parliament was directed against Arminianism, and particularly against certain persons near the King, as Neile, Bishop of Winchester, and Laud, now Bishop of Bath and Wells, "justly suspected to be unsound in their opinions that way." In Laud's answer, a principal point made was that such an accusation was a grave reflection upon his Majesty; "as if his Majesty is so ignorant in matters of religious belief, or so indifferent in maintaining them, as that any singular opinion should grow up, or any faction prevail in his kingdom without his knowledge." This was quite in accordance with Laud's Erastian principles. Apparently Clergy and Convocation were useful chiefly in giving attention to matters commended to their consideration by the Sovereign.

The public feeling, however, only grew stronger against the tendency which was regarded as Romanizing; and the King thought it prudent to recall Abbot

to court; and although Montagu had been made a bishop, his book *Appello Cæsarem* was now suppressed. At the same time a declaration was prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, requiring that these controversies between Calvinists and Arminians should cease; but the House of Commons regarded this as simply a condemnation of Calvinism, and on the very first day of their session, Francis Rouse, author of the Scotch metrical version of the Psalms, made a violent attack upon the Arminians. He was followed by Pym and others on the same side, and as a result the House declared their adhesion to the Lambeth Articles. The first recorded utterance of Oliver Cromwell is on the same side. Parliament was dissolved in 1629 and did not meet again for eleven years. In the previous year Mountain had been removed to York, and Laud succeeded him as Bishop of London (July 4, 1628). Shortly afterwards, whilst Montagu was being consecrated at Croydon, there came the news of the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham by John Felton at Portsmouth (August 23, 1628). The vices of Buckingham have been exaggerated, his virtues forgotten, his personal beauty made almost a fault. To Laud his loss was great.

We must pass lightly over the civil and political side of Laud's work, although it is not easily separated from the ecclesiastical. One work of great importance which he undertook was a careful inquiry into various abuses which were tending to the destruction of the property of the Church and the hindering of her usefulness. Bishops, says Heylin,

were selling off their woods to enrich themselves, thereby impoverishing their successors. The bishops were living at Westminster, so as to be on the outlook for further preferment, instead of residing in their dioceses and doing their work there; and a multitude of lecturers were found "in the city or country, whose work it was to undermine both the doctrine and the government" of the Church. Laud reported this state of things to the King; and his Majesty issued a body of "Instructions" to the bishops; in which they were told to be careful not to ordain unfit persons to the ministry; nor to allow afternoon sermons, but to enforce catechising. All lecturers were to read divine service, properly vested, before their lecture. Lectures were to be arranged to be given by a number of neighboring Clergy preaching in turn, and they were to preach in their gowns, not in cloaks. None, save noblemen and those qualified by law, were to retain chaplains in their houses. All were required to be regular in attendance at divine service. Bishops were not to grant leases after they had been nominated to other sees, nor to cut down timber but merely to receive the rents due, or their nominations would be cancelled. A report was to be made, at the beginning of each year, of the manner in which these instructions had been carried out.

It must be confessed that this reveals a very bad state of things; and the opposition aroused by the instructions would be hardly intelligible, but for the restraints put upon the lectures. Some of the complaints were ludicrous enough, especially those of

the bishops who were unwilling to be banished to their dioceses. The King and his counsellor were resolved to go further. Some of the Calvinists were not content to submit to the restraint laid upon them by the declaration prefixed to the Articles, and insisted on preaching on predestination and election. For this offence Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, was summoned to appear before the Council, and admonished to desist from such preaching for the future, and three clergymen of Oxford were censured and expelled from the University. It became manifest that there was to be no toleration for any opinions but those of the King and the Bishop of London. Even the foreign Protestants who had been guaranteed in the exercise of their own religion by Elizabeth and James were now required to conform to the Church of England under pain of excommunication.

So far Laud had been Bishop of London ; but the change which took place at the death of Abbot was merely a nominal one. When Laud was confirmed Archbishop of Canterbury, September 19, 1633, he took possession legally of the authority which he had previously exercised in fact. Both he and the King seemed satisfied that, as their aims were good, so they were being successfully attained, and this without any serious opposition from the people. The first to attempt to undeceive the Archbishop was a young man named Edward Hyde, afterwards the famous Lord Clarendon. He was at this time only twenty-five years of age, while Laud was sixty ; and

it says something for the humility of the Archbishop that he allowed such freedom of speech.¹

Mr. Hyde found the Archbishop walking in his garden, and was asked, "What good news from the country?" To which he answered that there was none good: the people were universally discontented; and many spoke evil of his Grace, as the cause of all that was amiss. He replied that he was sorry for it: he knew he did not deserve it; and that he must not give over serving the King and the Church, to please the people. Hyde replied that this was not necessary, but that people complained of the sharpness and harshness of his manner; and that this kind of behavior on his part was generally commented upon. Laud listened with great patience, and said that he was very unfortunate to be so ill-understood; that he meant very well; but that by an imperfection of nature, which he said often troubled him, he might speak with such sharpness of voice as to make men believe that he was angry when there was no such thing. Hyde persisted in his remonstrances, and entreated the Archbishop to show a more conciliatory manner, and treat men with more courtesy. The Archbishop smiled and said he could only undertake for his heart, that he had very good meaning; for his tongue he could not undertake that he should not sometimes speak more hastily and sharply than he should do. Instead of being offended with the freedom of the young man,

¹ Others place this incident at a later period, six years afterwards. Hyde would then have been thirty-one.

it is said that the Archbishop always treated him very graciously.

There seems to be no doubt that Laud was about this time offered a cardinal's hat by a person coming to him privately and assuring him that he did so by commission of his superiors. Whether the offer was a genuine one or merely an attempt to entrap the Archbishop, it was at once rejected by him; and he states, in his diary, that "something dwelt within him which would not suffer that, till Rome was otherwise than it was at the present time."

In every department the Archbishop put forth his energies for the enforcement of the law of the Church. The Injunctions of 1629 were renewed; and, that which gave still more offence, King James's "Book of Sports" was commended to the people, in opposition to the Puritanical severity which was being enforced in different parts of the country. Chief Justice Richardson had forbidden all village feasts and wakes on Sunday, and had ordered the Clergy to publish the prohibition in time of service. For this he was reproved by the Archbishop at the Council Table, and the King, in republishing the "Book of Sports," declared that "these feasts with others shall be observed, and that our justices of the peace shall see them conducted orderly, and that neighborhood and freedom with manlike and lawful exercises be used." This was one of the most serious matters of accusation against Laud when he was afterwards brought to trial.

But one of the gravest changes effected by Laud, and one most strongly objected to by the Puritans,

was the removal of the Holy Table to the east end of the chancel and placing it north and south, as it was said, altarwise. This was the position of the Table until the second Book of Edward VI. Under this, however, many altars were destroyed and tables set up, generally standing east and west in the middle of the chancel or in the body of the church. Under Elizabeth, it was directed that, at the time of communion, the table might be put in the most convenient position; but at other times it generally stood in its old place.

Great irregularities had taken place and even gross irreverence had been shown in the treatment of sacred buildings and their furniture. Business was often transacted within the churches. The Holy Table was even used by the church wardens for the settlement of their accounts and the transaction of parish business; and it was quite common for hats and cloaks to be deposited upon it. Occasionally it was used as a seat. Laud gives an account of an incident which speaks very plainly of the state of things. Writing to the King, he says, "At Taplow there happened a very ill accident by reason of not having the Communion Table railed in, that it might be kept from profanations. For in the sermon time a dog came to the table and took the loaf of bread prepared for the Holy Sacrament in his mouth, and ran away with it. Some of the parishioners took the same from the dog, and set it again upon the table. After sermon, the minister could not think fit to consecrate this bread, and other fit for the sacrament

was not to be had in that town, so there was no communion.

During Abbot's time things had probably got worse; and it was certainly no great proof of superstition on the part of Laud, that he should desire the more decent ordering of the furniture for the most sacred ordinance of the church. All that he asked was what is found, at the present moment, in almost every church of the Anglican communion—that the table should be placed at the east end of the Church, raised a little above the pavement, and railed in. Yet for this, perhaps more than for anything else, he was accused of intending “to advance and usher in popery;” although his plea will now be generally received: “it is surely not popery to set a rail to keep profanation from the Holy Table; nor is it any innovation to place it at the upper end of the chancel, as the altar stood.” He declared that the position of the table signified no difference of doctrine, but that the order was given for the sake of uniformity. And he quotes the injunctions of Elizabeth which order “that the Holy Table in every church (mark it, I pray you, not in the royal chapel or cathedrals only, but in *every church*) shall be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood. Now,” he goes on, “the altar stood at the upper end of the choir, north and south. . . . So you see here's neither popery nor innovation in all the practice of Queen Elizabeth or since.”

In spite of this which to ourselves sounds quite reasonable, the greatest excitement and opposition to

the change arose. Among those who took part against Laud was Williams; but none of those who wrote against the position of the altar denied the irreverence of which the Archbishop complained. "Such," says Fuller, "was the heat about this altar, that both sides had almost sacrificed up their mutual charity thereon, and this controversy was prosecuted with much needless animosity."

Laud said he cared comparatively little for the name that should be given, whether table or altar; but he contended for the position in the interests of reverence; and the bishops generally agreed with him, even some of those who had previously opposed him. In some dioceses the bishops explained the reasons for the change, before giving the order, and in such cases there was seldom much trouble. But in other places there was considerable opposition; and in the diocese of Lincoln, Bishop Williams refused to put the order in operation. This gave rise to a controversy between Williams and Laud who claimed to exercise his authority as metropolitan in the diocese, a claim which was allowed by the courts. But although the diocese was visited, and injunctions issued by the Vicar-General, Williams did what he could to prevent conformity to them. He pretended obedience by putting a rail round the table, while leaving it in the middle of the chancel.

Hardly less offensive than the change in the position of the altar was the ritual which Laud is said to have practised. One of the things charged against him was the use of the cope, although even Abbot had worn a richly decorated cope at the Coronation

of King Charles. One of the witnesses against Laud at his trial said, "There were copes used in some colleges, and a traveller might say, upon the sight of them, that he saw first such a thing upon the Pope's back." "The wise man," retorted Laud, "might have said as much of a gown." And he pleaded quite properly that they were not only allowed, but required by the canons to be worn in cathedral churches. Another accusation was the use of wafer bread in the sacrament. This he denied. "For wafers," he said, "I never either gave or received the communion but in ordinary bread. At Westminster, I knew it was sometimes used, but as a thing indifferent." Some other accusations were absurd, such as the charge of holding the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Even the accounts of extravagant gestures at the communion must be received with qualification, when we remember that, in the eyes of some of Laud's Puritan opponents, the mere kneeling at the reception of the communion would savor of idolatry.

Laud was not contented with merely putting the English Church in order: his aims extended to Ireland and Scotland as well. He was deeply interested in the work done in Ireland by his friend Lord Strafford; but he was greatly set upon completing the organization of the Scottish Church after the English model, and so bringing to completion the work begun by the restoration of the episcopate under King James. Laud had then wished to introduce the Prayer Book into Scotland; but the King knew the people too well to allow it. Now, however,

both Laud and Charles were hoping that the time was ripe for such an undertaking. The King, on his visit to Edinburgh in 1633, had left directions for the compilation of a Prayer Book, and had appointed a committee of Scottish bishops for that purpose, directing them to correspond with Laud.

A book was prepared for Scotland, and signed by the King, September 28, 1634; but a body of canons was first prepared, and published to prepare the way for the Prayer Book (1635). So far was it from having this effect, that the people were alarmed at the high claims set forth for the Sovereign, and at some of the requirements of the canons, besides that they were enjoined to a strict observance of a Prayer Book which they had never seen. Before the book was put forth, it underwent further revision and it finally received the King's signature and confirmation, December 20, 1636. Laud has been held responsible for this Prayer Book; but two things seem to be quite certain, first, that he did not offer himself for the work, but simply acted under the instructions of the King, and as coöperating with the Scottish bishops; and further, that he was all along desirous of having the English Prayer Book introduced into Scotland without any changes being made. Not only was Laud made responsible for what was done, and no one rejoiced more than he did at the introduction of the Prayer Book, but he was charged with intending to introduce Romanism as well. It may be well to recall his self-vindication. "The worst thought," he says, "I had of any Reformed Church in Christendom was to wish it like the

Church of England, and so much better as it should please God to make it. And I hope that this was neither to negotiate with Rome, nor to reduce them to heresy in doctrine, nor to superstition and idolatry in worship; no, nor to tyranny in government; all which are most wrongfully imputed to me. And the comparing of me to the Pope himself I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against Popish superstition than any presbyter of Scotland hath done. And for my part I could be content to lay down my life to-morrow upon condition that the Pope and Church of Rome would admit and confirm the Service Book which hath been so eagerly charged against me. For were that done, it would give a greater blow to Popery, which is the corruption of the Church of Rome, than any that hath yet been given, and that they know full well."

Here as always there is no question of Laud's sincerity, or even of the general excellence of his aims. Nor, perhaps, can we hold him entirely responsible for the mismanagement of the affair. As regards the changes in the Service Book, they were unimportant. "Presbyter" was substituted for "Priest." The Consecration Prayer was altered, and certain other changes were made in the communion service, in the judgment of learned ritualists, all for the better. Some of them are retained in the American Prayer Book. But the manner of the introduction of the book was most unfortunate. No care was taken to prepare the minds of the people or to conciliate them to the proposed change; nor, on the other hand,

were precautions taken for the enforcing of obedience. Clarendon, who was no friend to Puritanism or Presbyterianism, says that "everything was left in the same state of unconcernedness as it was before; not so much as the Council being better informed of it, as if they had been sure that all men would have submitted to it for conscience' sake."

The new service was read for the first time in St. Giles's Cathedral, Edinburgh, in July, 1637; and it was received with a burst of indignation and furious rioting, the Dean being assailed with missiles of all kinds. When the bishop went into the pulpit, he was saluted in the same manner, and in leaving the Cathedral, narrowly escaped with his life. The immediate effects of the innovation were very serious; but the ultimate consequences were far worse. It was not merely the end of episcopacy in Scotland, but it was the beginning of a movement that was to work endless woe for England. A committee, known as "The Tables," was formed in Edinburgh, and they drew up the tremendous document known as the "Solemn League and Covenant," by which they pledged themselves and all who should join them to bring about "without respect of persons the extirpation of prelacy; that is church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy" throughout Great Britain and Ireland. The document was read aloud and subscribed in Grey Friar's Church (March, 1638). Attempts at conciliation were made by the King's government; but it was

too late. A general assembly was demanded and conceded by the King. They met, abolished episcopacy, excommunicated all who should favor it, condemned the Prayer Book and other parts of the English system introduced into Scotland. The King had so far to give way as to sanction the Covenant, and order the Service Book and canons to be set aside. But the effect of the movement in England had yet to be seen.

When Parliament met April 13, 1640, it became evident that the methods of Laud had produced the worst possible effects in the country, had greatly strengthened the cause of the Puritans, and alienated many of the best men from the Church. The feeling of resentment broke out at the opening of Parliament in the utterances of several of the members; but it was Pym who on the 17th of April enumerated in detail the grievances of the people and the offences of the clergy: "Popish books published and used, and the introducing of popish ceremonies, as altars, bowing towards the east, pictures, crosses, crucifixes, and the like, which, of themselves considered, are so many dry bones, but, being put together, make the man." He then went on to complain of the discouraging of goodly men; of the deprivation of ministers for refusing to read the Book of Sports; of the encroaching upon the King's authority by ecclesiastical courts, especially the High Commission.

A few days afterwards (April 28) the Commons had a conference with the Lords, declaring that they would be bound by no canons passed by Convoca-

tion, without the consent of Parliament; and they enumerated certain grievances which they wanted removed. As they showed no disposition to give way or to grant the supplies unless their grievances were redressed, the King dissolved Parliament. But it was evident that neither he, nor even Laud who began to feel troubled, had formed any just conception of the gravity of the situation. Among the difficulties of their position was the doubtful legality of some of their orders. In regard to the place of the Holy Table, they might quote the injunction of Elizabeth, but the rubric which was sanctioned by Statute Law allowed the table to be placed in the chancel in the body of the Church. In order to put an end to doubts on this subject a canon was passed in Convocation. But such a process was not likely to propitiate those who complained that the ecclesiastical courts were exceeding their power. And the way in which Convocation was kept together after the dissolution of Parliament made its ordinances still more suspected. As it seemed doubtful whether this could be done, the judges were consulted and gave their opinion that the Convocation, being called by the King's writ, might remain until it was dissolved, notwithstanding the dissolution of Parliament. The judges were probably right; but, in order to make sure, a new writ was issued; and this was a mistake and probably illegal.

This was not the worst of the matter. In drawing up the canon required, the assembly prescribed a new oath to be taken by the clergy. This, in itself, was objectionable; but the form of the oath

was worse. It will be better to give its terms: "I, A. B., do swear that I approve the doctrine and discipline or government established in the Church of England as containing all things necessary to salvation, and that I will not endeavor by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any popish doctrine contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *et cetera*, as it stands now established."

This oath was evidently intended as a counterblast to the Solemn League and Covenant; but the addition of the words *et cetera* was most unfortunate. In fact it was put in the draft and intended to be expanded by the mention of the officers named in the Solemn League; but the thing was done in a hurry, and so the phrase was permitted to remain. The whole country was instantly in commotion; and everywhere there was refusal to take the oath. Sanderson, who was then a proctor in Convocation, and after the Restoration for a short time Bishop of Lincoln, a man well affected towards the Archbishop, wrote to warn him of the "great distaste that is taken generally in the Kingdom at the oath enjoined by the late canons." The King found it necessary to give orders that the oath should not be enforced until the next Convocation. One result of the measure was rioting in London. The Convocation had to be protected by a military guard, the Archbishop, attacked at Lambeth, had taken refuge at Whitehall, and the High Commission Court had retired to St.

Paul's, but here they were assaulted by the mob. Everywhere the suspicion was abroad that the liberties of the people, civil and religious, were in danger. Such were the preparations for the holding of the Long Parliament.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE LONG PARLIAMENT AND THE REBELLION.



HERE are few things more remarkable or more instructive than the vicissitudes of religious thought and sympathy in the same people. If one were to judge by mere appearances, one should suppose that a generation had undergone a thorough revolution of opinion. At the end of King Edward's reign the people are apparently sick of Protestantism, as they are of Romanism at the end of Mary's. Elizabeth seems to leave the country consolidated in Anglicanism, which gets shaken under James and almost supplanted by Puritanism under Charles. There is no doubt that considerable changes of this kind actually did take place. Men's opinions are not the result of mere thought and argument, but largely of sympathy and association. But in each case the real change was less than the apparent; and in the days of Charles and Laud many men were driven into the Puritan camp, because it seemed the refuge of liberty, when they had no real sympathy with Puritan theology.

The Long Parliament opened on the 3d of November, 1640; and the topics which had caused the dissolution of the Short Parliament immediately came to the front. Complaints arose from all quar-

ters of the Court of High Commission, of the ill-treatment of the Puritan Clergy, and especially of the "most monstrous oath" recently imposed by the canon of the synod; and the denunciations of the novelties of ritual and the like were repeated. In 1637 Prynne had been placed in the pillory and others had been fined and mutilated for libelling the bishops; and now in the Parliament it was proposed that compensation should be made to them, and that the money should be paid by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other ecclesiastical commissioners.

The first clergyman assailed was Cosin, after the Restoration Bishop of Durham; and on November 10, the first attack on Laud was made by Sir Edward Dering, a man who was neither a Puritan nor a personal enemy of the Archbishop, who declared that he had no thought of revolution in Church or State.

Williams had been three years a prisoner, and Laud was generally believed to have been the chief instigator of this punishment. It was thought, therefore, that he might be made an instrument for the prosecution of Laud, and an order for his release was procured from the King. Williams immediately returned to his duties as Dean of Westminster, but showed that he had no mind to serve the Puritans or to retaliate upon Laud. Still the work went on. The canons made in the late Convocation were declared in the House of Commons (December 16), to be "against the King's prerogative, the fundamental laws of the realm, and the liberty and property of the subject;" and, as Laud was chiefly responsible

for these canons, a committee was appointed to inquire into all his previous actions, and to prepare a bill against those of the Convocation who had subscribed the canons. On the same day a lengthy document was presented to the House of Lords by the Scotch commissioners, charging Laud and Strafford with similar offences. Two days later (December 18) Mr. Holles appeared before the Lords, and in the name of the Commons accused the Archbishop of high treason, upon which Laud exclaimed indignantly that not one man in the House of Commons did in his heart believe it. He was committed to the custody of the Black Rod, and on the 1st of March in the following year sent to the Tower.

The Archbishop being in prison, Convocation became powerless, and the work against the Church went on. Commissioners were appointed to "demolish and remove out of churches and chapels all images, altars or tables turned altarwise, crucifixes, superstitious pictures, and other monuments and relics of idolatry." The legality of such a proceeding was highly doubtful, and in many cases the action of the iconoclasts was resisted by the clergy and church wardens.

Another serious step was the appointment of a Commission (March 15), to consist of ten earls, ten barons, and ten bishops, who might call in divines for consultation. They were to review doctrines and discipline, not only in regard to recent innovations, but with respect to the "degrees and perfection of the Reformation itself," in other words to consider whether the work might not be carried further. Of

the bishops only Williams, Hall, Morton, and Usher, who had come from Armagh to Carlisle, seem to have attended. They condemned canopies over the Holy Table, credence tables, and candlesticks on the altar; and they confirmed the use of the authorized version, and suggested the removal of the prohibited times of marriage from the Prayer Book.

But a bolder move was made when (May 20) a bill was introduced, again by Sir Edward Dering, which was afterwards known as the "Root and Branch Bill," providing for the abolition of the bishop and all his officers, and also of deans and chapters. The second reading was carried May 27; and on June 15 it was resolved that "deans and chapters, archdeacons, prebendaries, canons, etc., should be utterly abolished and taken away out of the Church." But this was further than the mover had intended to go. Sir E. Dering evidently had not considered the effect of his bill, for he declared himself in favor of bishops whom he believed to be of apostolical permission, if not of apostolical institution. Other members joined in similar expressions, proving that the alliance of these men with the Presbyterians was hardly of their own choice.

About this time arose the famous controversy respecting episcopacy in which several very eminent men took place. Bishop Hall was the first to come forward in defence of his order; and he was answered by five Puritan writers whose initials united formed the word *Smectymnus*. Their work was answered by Usher, whilst the other side was supported by no less a person than Milton. Petitions from

both sides were addressed to Parliament, but it was not clear that the majority were in favor of the abolition of episcopacy. The Lords would not consent to the expulsion of the bishops from Parliament, and the Root and Branch Bill had not become law at the end of the session.

The counsels of Laud to King Charles had not always been wise or prudent; but his course was always definite and consistent. His schemes were wrecked by imprudence, but not ever by vacillation. When Charles was left without the support of Laud, he committed almost every fault in government that was possible. He was stubborn when he ought to have yielded. He gave way when he ought to have stood firm. It is said that it was by Bishop Williams's advice that he consented to the death of Strafford; but nothing can be urged in defence of such a crime. Strafford's only fault was absolute loyalty to a foolish and self-willed ruler. In the same spirit of weakness he undertook that the Long Parliament should not be dissolved without its own consent; whilst in Scotland he assented to a bill which declared that "the government of the Church by bishops was repugnant to the Word of God; that the prelates were enemies to the true Protestant religion; that their order was to be suppressed, and their lands given to the King." Well might Strafford exclaim: "Put not your trust in princes!" Candid readers of history can hardly wonder, even if they must regret, that the government of Charles was an utter failure.

If the English people could have trusted the King, all might have been changed. During the first ses-

sion of this Parliament many concessions had been obtained. The courts of Star Chamber and High Commission had been abolished, ship-money had been surrendered, and other royal privileges given up. But they could not trust the King; and so, when Parliament assembled in October, the Commons drew up a statement known as the Grand Remonstrance in which they set forth the faults of the King's government from the beginning. The statements were considerably exaggerated, but they were accepted by the House. When they came to the consideration of the necessary remedies, however, there came a divergence. The Puritan leaders proposed that ministers should be responsible to Parliament, and that church matters should be under the control of an assembly of divines nominated by Parliament. But Hyde, Falkland and their followers saw in this only the establishment of a Presbyterian despotism, and opposed the proposition so resolutely that the debate was continued until after midnight. The Puritan side triumphed by a majority of eleven. Still the cause of the King was not yet lost. When he returned to London, November 25, two days after the debate on the Grand Remonstrance, and declared that he intended to govern according to the laws, and would maintain the Protestant religion as it had been established in the times of Elizabeth and his father, he was enthusiastically cheered in the streets; but some imprudent actions of his and the news of the rebellion spreading in Ireland, which was by many attributed to the influence of the Queen, excited fresh anxiety and suspicion.

The bishops became the special object of the popular hatred, and a demand was made that they should be expelled from the House of Lords. So threatening became the attitude of the mob that on December 27, the bishops made their escape from the House, and took refuge at the lodgings of Williams, now Archbishop of York. Williams had the reputation of being a man well versed in law, and at his suggestion the bishops drew up a protest to the Lords, declaring all the proceedings of the Upper House, during their enforced absence, to be void. It appears that, in doing so, the bishops were within their rights. No one can accuse the historian Hallam of undue partiality to the clerical order; yet he declares that this protest was "abundantly justifiable" from a legal point of view. But many things which are lawful may not be expedient. The Lords were offended, and the enemies of the bishops were jubilant.

The bishops, thirteen in number, including their leader, Archbishop Williams of York, were arraigned by the House of Commons as guilty of High Treason—a very absurd accusation, yet one which enabled their accusers provisionally to take action against them. With the exception of Bishop Hall of Norwich and Bishop Morton of Durham, who were consigned to the custody of the Black Rod, all the bishops were sent to the Tower. After eighteen days of imprisonment ten were released; but on February 6, 1642, they were deprived of their authority, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction was vested in a committee of the House of Commons. As usual, the King, left

to his own judgment and action, after a good deal of hesitation and with great unwillingness, gave his consent to the measure. It has been urged, in his defence, that this is the only bill to the prejudice of the Church which he ever sanctioned, and that he did so by the persuasion of the Queen, who cared nothing for the bishops of the English Church, and thought by this means to ingratiate herself with the Commons. When Laud heard, in prison, of what had been done, he exclaimed: "God be merciful to this sinking Church." The passing of this bill, says Clarendon, "exceedingly weakened the King's party; not only as it perpetually swept away so considerable a number out of the House of Peers, which were constantly devoted to him, but as it made impression on others whose minds were in suspense, and shaken as when foundations are dissolved."

Although we are little concerned here with the civil history of the period, it is necessary to refer to the attempted arrest of five members of Parliament whom the King charged with a treasonable correspondence with the Scots. Foremost among these were Pym and Hampden, the leaders of the opposition. As the Commons showed no disposition to surrender the accused, the King proceeded in person to the House of Commons; but the men had fled to the city. It was one of those acts of the King which served to render impossible any attempt at reconciliation. As he left the House, cries of "Privilege" arose from all sides. The act of the King was regarded not as an endeavor to enforce the law, but as an attempt to intimidate the House. The Com-

mons and the country alike resented the attempt. On January 10, 1642, Charles left Whitehall, never to return until he was brought back to be tried for his life. On the same day the five members were escorted back in triumph to Westminster.

Both sides now prepared for war; but it would lead us too far from our purpose to discuss the rights and wrongs of the conflict of King and Parliament, so we will content ourselves by following, for the most part, the religious history of the period. In a proclamation issued soon after by Parliament they declared that "they intended a due and necessary reformation of the government and liturgy of the Church, and to take away nothing in the one or in the other but what should be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome; and for the better effecting thereof, speedily to have consultation with learned and godly divines; and because that would never of itself attain the end sought therein, they would also use their utmost endeavors to establish learned and preaching ministers with a good and sufficient maintenance throughout the whole Kingdom." Here was clearly an expansion of the system of lecturers who were as dear to the Puritan heart, as they were objectionable to the ordinary churchman. Many of them had ostentatiously ignored the Prayer Book, prefixing to their sermons Bible reading, extempore prayer, and metrical hymns; and Parliament was apparently prepared to sanction this kind of service in place of the established ritual of the Church.

How far the Parliament might have gone in this

direction in the way of natural development we cannot tell, as they were not left to work out their own theories by themselves. When the struggle began between the King and Parliament, the latter applied to the Scotch who had more than once taken arms against the King for the maintenance of their own form of religion. The Scotch naturally thought that, as the Parliament was contending against the same kind of system which they had rejected by force, so it was reasonable that they should have a common understanding. Quite naturally, therefore, they made their coöperation conditional upon the agreement that there should be "one Confession of Faith, one Directory of Worship, one public Catechism, and one form of Church government, and that prelacy should be plucked up root and branch, as a plant which God hath not planted."

As the House of Commons had already refused to pass a bill embodying principles almost identical with these, they were hardly prepared for such a proposal; but there seemed little choice before them. Accordingly, the Root and Branch Bill was again introduced into the Commons and passed, and after a delay of four months was adopted by the Lords. The proof, as Neal remarks, that the Parliament was not inclined to this measure, was the provision that it should not come into effect for a year; and it would never have taken effect at all, if they could have come to some accommodation with the King.

It was only when the King's side seemed to be gaining the upper hand that the Parliament resolved

to give in to the demands of the Scots, and passed an ordinance (June 18, 1643) "for the calling of an assembly of learned and godly divines, and others, to be consulted with by the Parliament for settling the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." This was the beginning of the famous Westminster Assembly from which emanated the documents which have ever since been regarded as the standards of the Presbyterian churches, the Confession of Faith and the Longer and Shorter Catechisms. They were to meet on the 1st of July, 1643, and to continue their sessions until they were dissolved by Parliament. The subjects with which they should deal would be prescribed by one or both of the Houses of Parliament. They were to consist of one hundred and thirty-one divines, and thirty laymen of whom ten should be Lords and twenty Commoners; and Commissioners from Scotland were to sit with them. The assembly opened at Westminster on the 1st of July, sixty-nine divines being present.

Some preliminary work was done by the English members, but the real business of the assembly began after the arrival of the Scottish Commissioners. They had been instructed to insist upon the acceptance by the English of the "Covenant" as the condition of Scotch coöperation. There can be no doubt that such a proposition was most distasteful to a large number of the English members of the assembly. However, it was a question of accepting the Covenant or renouncing the help of the Scottish army,

and the need of the Parliament was great. They agreed therefore to the requirement that they should accept "the reformation of religion in the Church of England according to the example of the best reformed churches," that is to say,—the constitution of the Church of England was to become Presbyterian in doctrine, discipline, and ritual. Sir Harry Vane, who saw the danger to religious liberty in such an engagement, managed to get added the words, "and according to the Word of God." Such an addition could hardly be objected to by those who declined to recognize any source of authority save the Bible; but it left it open for any one to form his own judgment as to what was or was not "according to the Word of God."

The Solemn League and Covenant was subscribed by the assembly and the House of Commons September 25, 1643;* and it was ordered to be read on the following Sunday in all the churches in London. It was further enacted that every person in England above the age of eighteen should take the Covenant on February 2, 1644. A more tyrannical proceeding could hardly be imagined; nor one more at variance with the pretensions of a Parliament, which professed to be the defender of liberty and the rights of conscience. Reasonable men saw at once that English churchmen, of whatever complexion, could not take this Covenant "without injury and perjury to themselves;" and even a stiff Presbyterian like Richard Baxter declared, in opposing the requirement, that he could "never judge it seemly for one believing in God to play fast and loose with a dreadful oath." It

is said that the oath was not imposed upon many of the Episcopal Clergy who were known to be favorable to the Parliament, whilst it formed an easy and convenient method of ejecting from their benefices those "malignants" whom it was thought necessary to dispossess.

Various abuses arose out of this state of things. Hundreds of parishes were left without incumbents, so that the churches were taken possession of by wild enthusiasts without education or settled principles, and, to the great scandal of the better kind of men, the divines of the assembly not only took the best of the vacated benefices for themselves, but held several of them together. As the Puritan Milton remarks, "the most part of them were such as had preached and cried down with great show of zeal the avarice and pluralities of bishops and prelates, and one cure of souls was a full employment for one spiritual pastor, how able soever. Yet they wanted not boldness, to the ignominy and scandal of their pastor-like profession, to seize into their hands sometimes two or more of the best livings, collegiate masterships in the Universities, rich lectures in the city, setting sail to all winds that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms."

The manner of conducting divine service became very uncertain. Those who attempted to continue the use of the Prayer Book were interrupted and insulted. Others followed the guidance of a "Directory" drawn up by the Westminster assembly on the basis of Cartwright's. This Directory, after being approved by the General Assembly of the

Church of Scotland, was prescribed for use in England, January 3, 1645. The preface to the book set forth the reasons for the changes made, in that the English Liturgy had been an offence not only "to many of the godly at home," but to the reformed churches abroad. It had been made an idol, had encouraged the Papists, had produced "an idle and unedifying ministry," and so forth. An order followed imposing penalties on any who should use the Prayer Book either publicly or privately, five pounds for the first offence, ten pounds for the second, and for the third a year's imprisonment. All this reminds us of the "liberty" obtained by the French Revolution, and Madame Roland's comment on the same.

Looking back upon those doings from the experience of recent times, and marking how nearly all the more highly educated of the Clergy of the Westminster Confession have endeavored to make, at least, a partial return to the type of worship represented by the English Prayer Book, we find it difficult to understand its abandonment throughout the country, except that to numbers of the people its use was associated with the despotism of Charles and Laud. The new system, however, did not take permanent hold of the sympathies of the people. Even the Puritan historian testifies that "it proved not to the satisfaction of any one party of Christians."

The Clergy were soon between two fires. The King issued a proclamation from Oxford (November 13, 1645) condemning and forbidding the use of the Directory, and ordering the Book of Common

Prayer to be used under penalties in case the Directory should take its place. Some of the Clergy knew the contents of the Prayer Book so well, that they were accustomed to recite the greater part of the service without a book.

But there soon came to be serious divisions in the Puritan ranks. At the Westminster Assembly, if the majority were not certainly Presbyterian, it was at least finally agreed to accept that form of Church government; and at that time the Brownists or Independents were few in number. It is said that there were only five in the assembly, known as the five Dissenting Brethren, who held the views which have been noticed as those of the Brownists under Queen Elizabeth. These began now to be known as Independents, holding that "every particular congregation of Christians has an entire and complete power of jurisdiction over its members, to be exercised by the elders thereof within itself." Some of the most considerable men of the Puritan party, such as Cromwell and Vane, came to adhere to this sect; and in one respect they were honorably distinguished from Presbyterians and even from Episcopalians in preaching, although not always practising, the doctrine of liberty and religious toleration. In one respect, at least, they were more liberal than the Presbyterians, that they demanded no profession of faith, nor did they interfere with private convictions, so long as no attempt was made to give public expression to them. It was a very qualified kind of liberty, no doubt; but it was more than other denominations of Christians would sanction at that time.

It was difficult for Presbyterians and Independents to get along together; and this was found out when they met to devise some scheme of ordination and a system of government, a highly necessary matter, now that all kinds of men were climbing up into the sheepfold, to minister. When the Presbyterians brought their system before Parliament, declaring their government to be of divine appointment, and asking for something like absolute powers of government, they found considerable opposition not only from Independents like Cromwell, but from other members of the House who did not choose to surrender the power of Parliament to a religious body. Something like a modified Presbyterianism was adopted June 6, 1646; but the growth of Independency made it impossible to give general effect to this system. Reference has already been made to the doctrinal standards of the Westminster Assembly. The Confession of Faith was presented to Parliament in December, 1646.

The Clergy had a very hard time from the beginning of the Long Parliament. They were not only deprived of their means of livelihood, but in many cases their goods were seized, and themselves put in prison. Charges of all kinds were invented against them, sometimes of gross immorality, which were generally fabrications, and very commonly such as bowing at the name of Jesus, asking the communicants to come up to the rails instead of administering to them in their seats, and the like. All such cases came before a Grand Committee of Religion appointed by Parliament, early in its history (No-

vember 6, 1640); and often there was no pretence of justice or equity in the treatment of the accused. A committee consisting of thoroughly uneducated men often did not hesitate to judge the most difficult questions in divinity. The language used in speaking of the Clergy is almost incredibly coarse and revolting. It would be superfluous to dwell upon these persecutions which are set forth at length in Walker's "Sufferings of the Clergy."

The bishops were treated nearly as badly as the inferior Clergy. There was probably no bishop on the bench who was more popular with the Puritans than Joseph Hall, first of Exeter, and afterwards of Norwich. Yet as soon as the ordinance for the sequestration of the "malignant" Clergy came forth (April, 1643), all his goods were seized; they did not leave, he said "so much as a dozen of trenchers, or my children's pictures." Not only were his goods sold, but he was required to pay the arrears of rents which he had before forgiven to his tenants.

But at last there was one brought to trial whom none of the Puritans were inclined to spare. Yet there was a great difficulty in knowing how to proceed. For Laud, however narrow and perverse, was a persecutor on precisely the same principles as those on which his adversaries acted when they came to power, and the charge of treason was absurd. Laud petitioned in vain that he should be brought to trial; and he was forced to remain in the Tower for three years, knowing all the evil that was being wrought, and powerless to act or even to advise. He was also subjected to various insults during his imprisonment.

Prynne, who had suffered under Laud, was appointed to conduct the case against him; and, entering his apartment in the Tower, rifled his pockets and his trunk, carried off his papers, his diary, which he garbled and used unfairly, and his book of private devotions—written, as well as his diary by his own hand.

After many insults and delays the Archbishop appeared at the bar of the House of Lords, November 13, 1643; but there were further delays, and it was March 12, 1644, before the trial really began. After listening to a lengthy speech of accusation, Laud asked leave to speak. He repudiated with indignation the charge of attempting to overthrow the law, declaring that, as he was born and bred in the Church of England, so he had faithfully continued in the same, and had labored for the external worship of God, "too much slighted in most parts of this kingdom;" but that in this he had no thought of encouraging popery; and on this he dwelt at some length. The Archbishop was treated with great insolence by the attendants of the court and others, who could not bear to hear his defence of himself; and he seems to have endured all with much patience and forbearance. The trial was dragged out to great length simply because it was impossible to find him guilty of treason by any law new or old, or even by the "tyrannical traditions of Parliament." Six times in one month he was brought up, apparently for no other reason than to expose him to the insults of the mob. His diary, mutilated and garbled, was used against him, and every trifling incident in his life

which could be tortured into an appearance of evil, was brought forward. Of course the old charges about the Holy Table and the ceremonial of divine service were brought up.

The trial ended July 29, 1644, after lasting three months, during which time he had spoken twenty times in his defence. He was allowed to recapitulate on September 21, and his counsel were heard, October 11, on legal questions. The Archbishop's bearing impressed even his enemies. "To give him his due," said Prynne, "he made as full, as gallant, and as pithy a defence of so bad a cause, and spoke so much for himself as it was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that with so much art, sophistry, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and confidence, without the least blush of acknowledgment of guilt in anything, as argued him rather obstinate than innocent, impudent than penitent, a far better orator and sophister than Protestant or Christian, yea, a truer son of the Church of Rome than the Church of England." When it is remembered that this is the testimony of an envenomed adversary, thirsting for his blood, we may understand how much it means.

Laud was then summoned to the bar of the House of Commons, where he was informed that he was attainted of High Treason. He defended himself with great power (November 11); but they did not want defence or argument. Those in power had determined to put him to death, although killing in such a case was murder; and the bill of attainder passed, November 13. The peers held out for a time. At last six of them agreed with the Commons (January

4, 1645) and on the 10th of January he was beheaded on Tower Hill. He was seventy-two years of age. Laud was thoroughly honest and consistent, but he was impatient and irascible, and had no gift of conciliation. When it is added that he had adopted, in a time of revolution, extreme absolutist doctrines as to the government of Church and State, and had striven to give effect to them, it can be understood how he had made so many enemies. But his execution was a crime.

The work of levelling was carried on. In June, 1646, Oxford surrendered to the Parliament, and commissioners were appointed to visit the University and ejected from the colleges about six hundred members and all the heads except two. At this time the Civil War virtually came to an end; and Charles chose to give himself up to the Scots rather than to the Parliament. If he would have consented to establish Presbyterianism, they would have stood by him; but this he refused to do; and it must be remembered to his credit. It is no part of our business to follow the various incidents which occurred during the next two years. On the 1st of January, 1649, the Commons proposed to appoint a High Court of Justice to try the King; but the Lords refused to take part. On the fourth the Commons declared that, as representing the people, they had supreme power without the Lords; and on the 9th a special High Court of Justice was constituted by a mere fragment of the House. Many refused to be members of the court. Of one hundred and thirty-five who were named, only sixty-seven were present

when the trial began. In such circumstances only one result could be arrived at, that which was predetermined. He was condemned, sentenced to death, and on January 30, 1649, he was executed in front of the Palace of Whitehall. It is needless to dwell at length upon a scene so often described, or upon the calm dignity of the sufferer.

“He nothing common did, or mean
Upon that memorable scene.”

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE COMMONWEALTH.



THE state of religion after the death of the King became more and more anarchical. "Liberty of Prophesying" was granted to every form of belief except Anglicanism and Romanism. Presbyterianism had been established by the Parliament under the guidance of the Westminster Assembly; but there was no authority to enforce the system. The rights of patrons were ignored, and incumbents came to be chosen in large measures by the inhabitants of the parish. These might be Presbyterians or Independents or members of other sects that were springing up; and sometimes, when the incumbent was not approved by the parishioners, a separatist would hold services in private houses.

The requirement of the signature of the Covenant having been found to be impracticable, the Parliament had substituted a declaration called the "Engagement," which merely called upon all who ministered to swear that they "would be true and faithful to the government established, without King and House of Peers." Many of the Church Party thought it lawful and expedient to take the Engagement, seeing little prospect of the restoration of the monarchy. To the Presbyterians the arrangement was abhorrent, as doing away, in reality, with all re-

ligious tests and tending to make the Independent or congregational system supreme. Even Episcopalians might now minister as of old, if only they did not visibly use the Prayer Book or speak against the existing order of things.

Some of the Clergy regarded the acceptance of the Engagement as unlawful and dangerous; yet those who conformed and used the contents of the Prayer Book from memory were certainly helping to keep alive the spirit of attachment to the Church and her services. Thus Evelyn tells us of orthodox men who got into the pulpits, and how his child was christened and his wife churched in his library, because the parish minister durst not have used the services of the church to which he had always adhered.

Cromwell, with all his love of liberty, had a deep sense of order; and determined to put a stop to the prevalent lawlessness by the appointment of a body of commissioners, called "Triers," who should decide as to the fitness of men to be ministers of the word of God. The ordinance by which this new arrangement was introduced (March 20, 1654) is, in various respects, of great interest. It set forth that, in consequence of the lack of order for sometime past, "many weak, scandalous, popish, and ill-affected persons had intruded themselves" into livings; and therefore it was appointed that, for the future (the provision was also made retrospective for a year), any person appointed to a benefice or lectureship should be approved by these commissioners who were not only to judge of his character and his

learning, but also "of the grace of God in him," and his fitness to preach the Gospel. One result hoped for from the appointment of this commission was the removal of the Episcopalians, since the Triers were told not to give admission to any ministers until they should have experience of their "conformity and submission to the present government, his Highness and the Council." The candidates were often required to give an account of their spiritual experience and of the evidences of their conversion before they were accepted.

Other commissioners were appointed in the same year for the ejection of "scandalous ministers." But the English love of order began to assert itself against the prevalent disorder, and a leaning towards the strictness of Presbyterian government was displayed. Moreover the Parliament (the first Parliament in the Protectorate be it remembered) began to insist on changes which would greatly limit the power of the Protector, and give the country at large an opportunity of expressing its real mind. This was the last thing that Cromwell wanted. The monarchy had been destroyed by a Parliament which was only a "Rump," the majority of the English people, at least, were opposed to the new system, and Cromwell had no mind to be got rid of. He therefore required the members to sign an acknowledgment of the government as settled in a single person and in Parliament, and turned out all who refused to sign. As those who remained determined to carry out their plans, he dissolved Parliament.

In the judgment of the Puritans the restrictions upon the church clergy were insufficient; and accordingly attempts were made to punish those who, in church service, employed any parts of the Prayer Book. One of those charged with this offence was Peacock, the famous oriental scholar; and he would have been ejected from his rectory but for the interposition of the celebrated Independent divine, John Owen. Another case was that of Mr. Gunning who held a service in London on Christmas Day, 1657, at which Evelyn was present. During the administration of Holy Communion the chapel was surrounded by soldiers and all the congregation made prisoners. The soldiers did not interfere until the people went up to receive the sacrament; but then, says Evelyn, "they held their muskets against us as if they would have shot us at the altar." It was therefore with the greatest difficulty that the ordinances of the Church were continued. The Clergy who had refused to conform were almost starved, and the continuance of men in holy orders was secured by young men being sent to the Universities to be educated, and then being brought to one of the remaining bishops for ordination. This was, of course, done in secret.

The death of Oliver Cromwell, September 3, 1658, seemed to promise better things for the Church, which for some time were not realized. The Long Parliament, or rather the so-called Rump met again in 1659; but the contention between them and the army began again, and Monk, who was in command of the forces in Scotland, crossed the border and

was joined by Fairfax at York. Monk soon discovered that the Rump was getting to be detested by all parties, and he gave them to understand that it was time to have a new Parliament. On February 26, the Presbyterian members who had been turned out by Pride's Purge were brought back; and on March 16, the Long Parliament gave that assent to its own dissolution without which it maintained it could not legally be dissolved.

There could now be little doubt as to the future course of events. On April 4th Charles signed the "Declaration of Breda; offering a general pardon to all except those specially exempted by Parliament, and promising to secure confiscated estates to their new owners on such terms as Parliament might approve. "Because," he said, "the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other, which, when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed or better understood, we do declare a liberty to tender consciences, and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the Kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us for the full granting that indulgence."

It was brought as a reproach against the King that on this and other occasions he made promises which were not kept. There are two answers to this complaint. In the first place, Charles made it clear that

what was to be done must be done through the Parliament. Moreover, in regard to some other promises he said more than he had the power of carrying out. There seems no reason to doubt the new King's willingness to fulfil all the expectations which he had aroused ; but he had no mind to quarrel with his Parliament, and he would have accomplished no good by doing so.

The Declaration of Breda reached the English Parliament May 1, and was received with unanimous approval, followed by the resolution that "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this Kingdom, the Government is, and ought to be, by Kings, Lords, and Commons." It was a strange ending to the episode of the Commonwealth. Charles and Laud had made England Puritan or practically so ; the great Oliver, and his Ironsides, and his Major-Generals had made Puritanism nearly as offensive as Mary and Philip had made Romanism ; and Charles II. and the Church of England had opportunities such as are accorded to few rulers and few institutions. If there were many faults in this age, it was also distinguished by many great scholars, thinkers, theologians. It brings before us, at least, what may be called the last act in the great Drama of the Reformation ; and those who believe in the providential government of the Church and the nation will feel called upon to study that epoch with attention and reverence.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE WORK OF THE RESTORATION.



CHARLES II. entered London on his thirtieth birthday, May 29, 1660; and never was a monarch greeted with a more enthusiastic reception on his accession to the throne. One of the most important questions before the King and the people was the settlement of religion; and at first the Presbyterians entertained great expectations of the ascendancy of their own system.

When the Parliament decreed the King's restoration, they sent Commissioners to the Hague to escort him back, and a body of Presbyterian divines went with them, to urge the claims of their constitution. The Scotch ministers also wrote and reminded him of his having taken the Covenant, a memory not likely to bring pleasant reflections to his Majesty at any time; and the Presbyterians went so far as to express the confident hope that he would not allow the use of the Prayer Book and the surplice, even in his own chapel. They soon found that they had gone too far, and lowered their tone. But it also became manifest that the country was no more on their side than the King. While professing, under Charles I., to be the advocates of religious liberty, they had inaugurated a despotism much more op-

pressive. Even Milton declared that Presbyter was only "Old Priest writ large;" and the country had made the same discovery. One who was employed at this time to represent the Presbyterian interest in London, reported, "I find the Presbyterian cause wholly given up and lost."

No immediate attempt was made to dislodge the Presbyterian and Independent ministers. The King even chose some of his chaplains from them and had them to preach before him. He professed himself eager for unity and requested them to acquaint him with the changes which they desired in the services of the Church. Most of them found no fault with the Articles; but many objected to episcopacy and the Liturgy; and it was arranged that a conference should be held for the consideration of these subjects.

In the meantime, however, an act had been passed for the restoration to their benefices of those who had been driven out by the Long Parliament and Cromwell. Those of the Puritan clergy who were occupying the places of incumbents who had died were allowed, for the present, to retain their benefices. The services of the Church were restored in the Cathedrals and in the Universities; and the broken ranks of the Episcopate were filled up. Juxon, who had been Bishop of London before the rebellion, and had attended King Charles upon the scaffold, was now made Archbishop of Canterbury, although he was near the end of his long life, and had little strength left for the service of the Church. Among the new bishops consecrated the names of

Sanderson, Sheldon, Cosin, and Walton should be mentioned.

And now it became necessary to consider what concessions should be made to the Puritans, who had not been backward in making known their grievances and their wishes. Most of their demands were made under the influence of Baxter, a devout and learned man, but crotchety and self-opinionated. To an episcopacy limited by a standing counsel of presbyters the Puritans said they did not object; but they wanted the Liturgy to be conformed to Scripture language; and required that the surplice and other "ceremonies" should be abolished. The church divines were naturally surprised at such demands, considering the nature of the previous controversies between themselves and their opponents, and what had been the issue of them. They were willing, however, to have a revision of the Prayer Book.

A conference was called at which a declaration of the King was read to the two parties in presence of his Majesty at Worcester House, the residence of Lord Clarendon. A paper was there produced asking for toleration for Independents and Baptists, and Lord Clarendon remarked that it was the King's wish that a clause should be inserted giving liberty to all to meet for religious worship, "provided they did not to the disturbance of the peace," which was no more than had been promised in the Proclamation of Breda. Suspicion was aroused that it was intended to include Romanists, and this was opposed by Baxter. The declaration, thus considered, was

put forth October 25, and after recognizing the claims of tender consciences and the evils of divisions, promised certain reforms. Among these were the following: a large increase of suffragan bishops; a certain number of presbyters to be associated with the bishops in government; to ensure a real preparation and instruction before confirmation; to make the rural dean and certain assistants a body for settling disputes in each deanery, and for seeing that the clergy performed their duties aright; to have a revision of the Liturgy; and in the meantime to allow considerable liberty in the use of the Prayer Book.

When the declaration was brought before the Convention Parliament, they refused to legalize it, although a considerable number of the members were Presbyterians. When, therefore, a new Parliament assembled, much more loyalist and churchly in its sympathies, the expectations of relief on the part of the dissidents could not have been very high. They had, however, been promised a conference at which they might state their views, and a royal warrant for this was issued under date, March 25, (1661). Twelve bishops and twelve Presbyterian divines were invited, with nine assistants on each side from whom the places of the others should be supplied in case of their absence. The King declared his own esteem for the Book of Common Prayer; but inasmuch as objections had been brought against it, he thought it well that it should be reviewed and compared with the most ancient liturgies, and, if necessary, that alterations and amendments should be made in it.

The conference was begun at the Palace of the Savoy, on April 15; and, the Archbishop being old and infirm, the leadership was taken by Sheldon, Bishop of London. The Archbishop of York called upon Sheldon to make known the order of proceedings, when the Bishop declared that they, as churchmen, had no desire for any changes in the Prayer Book; but they would be glad to hear what the other party wanted. The dissidents who expected to engage in a disputation did not quite approve of this method; but Baxter accepted the challenge and after about a fortnight produced his "Reformed Liturgy," which he asked that the minister should be permitted to use, instead of the Book of Common Prayer, when he wished to do so. The services in Baxter's book were entirely made up of phrases from the Scriptures.

Baxter and the other divines on his side could not quite agree on this subject, and the latter brought up on their own account a "Petition to the Bishops." Admitting the excellence of the Book of Common Prayer, especially considering the time of its composition, they pointed out that it was drawn up partly to satisfy the Romanists, and said that it should now be made to satisfy the Presbyterians. Their objections strike at the whole structure of the book, and tend to the substitution of a service conducted entirely by the minister, and in which the congregation should take no part. Thus they objected to the number of short prayers and to the responses; also to Saints' Days, to Lent, to the exclusion of extempore prayer, to the reading of the Apocrypha,

to the use of the word Priest, and various other points. They wanted a longer Catechism. They wished to make optional the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at communion.

To this the bishops replied by pointing out the excellence of the Liturgy, and remarking that the sober members of the Church of England, who were attached to the Book of Common Prayer, deserved no less consideration than those who objected to it; and these desired no alteration. The Prayer Book, they said, had been compiled from Holy Scripture and the ancient liturgies, had nothing superfluous or unnecessary, and had been greatly appreciated by the foreign reformers. In regard to the shorter prayers and responses, they contended that they were better adapted for maintaining a devotional spirit than long, unbroken prayers; and, if the congregation might join with the minister in psalmody, why not in prayer? Saints' Days were of primitive use, and were sustained by the example of Christ in keeping the Feast of Dedication. So also they defended Lent, the exclusion of extempore prayer, and the reading of the Apocrypha.

The bishops, however, offered to make certain concessions which gave very little satisfaction to the dissidents; and it was agreed that the two parties should meet and discuss their differences. The discussion came to very little, since the bishops took the line which they had followed from the beginning, protesting their willingness to hear any objections to the Prayer Book, and to alter anything which might be proved to be wrong, asking the dissidents to dis-

tinguish between what they regarded as sinful in the Prayer Book, and what they opposed as merely inexpedient. In reply they brought forward eight particulars as sinful: 1. Requiring the use of the cross in baptism; 2. The wearing of a surplice by the officiating minister; 3. Kneeling at the reception of the communion; 4. Requiring ministers to pronounce all children regenerate in baptism, whether they were the children of believers or not; 5. Requiring ministers to deliver the sacrament to communicants individually, whether fit or unfit; 6. To absolve the unfit; 7. To give thanks for all whom they bury; and 8. To require that, before any one is permitted to preach, he must subscribe that there is nothing contrary to the Word of God in the Common Prayer Book, the Book of Ordination, and the Thirty-nine Articles.

It was not likely that such considerations would prevail with the opponents of the objectors; and in point of fact, it is said that some who were well disposed towards the Puritans and wished to make all reasonable concessions to them, were driven to a determined opposition. The time had expired before the controversy came to an end; and the conference came virtually to nothing. The commissioners reported to the King, "that the Church's welfare, that unity and peace, and his Majesty's satisfaction, were ends on which they were all agreed; but as to the means they could not come to an harmony."

If the Nonconformists fared badly at the Savoy Conference, they fared still worse with Parliament. This was the second Parliament of Charles II., the

former being called the Convention Parliament because it was convoked without the King's writ. This second Parliament assembled May 8, 1661; and if the former one was loyal, this, not improperly called the Cavalier Parliament, was passionately in favor of Church and King and opposed to the Puritans. This must be carefully borne in remembrance when we form our judgment of some of the measures of the Restoration which may seem objectionable on the ground of justice or expediency. The bishops and the clergy in general and the King were disposed to be more considerate to the Nonconformists than the Parliament would allow them to be.

There is something to be said for the feelings of indignation by which the Cavalier party were now swayed, just as we have allowed that the Puritans had great provocation in the early days of Charles and Laud; and we must try to understand the point of view of the Church and King party. They had been driven from their churches and their homes for maintaining their faith and devotion by men who had stirred up rebellion on the pretext of defending their civil and religious liberties. King Charles had been forced into war with his people because he would not submit to the decisions of Parliament; and those who had brought this charge against him, mutilated Parliament when they could not get a majority to do their bidding. Finally, with or without a relic of Parliament, the religious liberties of a majority of the English people had been ruthlessly trampled upon, their clergy driven to beggary, and their gentry deprived of their estates.

It was impossible that men, with injuries like these rankling in their hearts, should have been restored to power without thoughts of retaliation ; and there were few members of the new Parliament who had not suffered in some way at the hands of the mob or the soldiery during the rebellion. They voted that neither house could pretend to the command of the militia, nor could lawfully make war upon the King. The authors of seditious pamphlets were declared traitors. All who held office in municipal corporations were required to renounce the Covenant, and to take an oath of nonresistance, declaring it to be unlawful to take up arms against the King, and were also required to receive the Holy Communion according to the rite of the Church of England. The bishops were restored to their place in the House of Lords, and a declaration was made that the act abolishing the High Commission Court did not interfere with the authority of the bishops or the supremacy of the King. This was giving fair warning to the representatives of the dissidents as to what they might expect.

The House of Commons, anxious to prevent concessions to the Puritans, resolved, June 25, 1661, "that a committee be appointed to view the several laws for confirming the Liturgy of the Church of England, . . . and to bring in a compendious bill to supply any defect in the former laws, and to provide for an effectual conformity to the Liturgy of the Church for the time to come." On July 3d, the Prayer Book of James I. was brought into the House and referred to a committee which (July 8) recommended certain amendments. On the day fol-

lowing the bill for uniformity was read a third time; so that, whilst the Savoy Conference was still going on, the House of Commons had declared that there must be conformity to the Book of Common Prayer under serious penalties. As it was known that a revision was being undertaken the House of Lords laid the bill aside, and Parliament was prorogued until the 30th of November.

In the meantime Convocation had met on the 8th of May, and had prepared a Thanksgiving Service for the 29th of May, the anniversary of the King's birth and of the Restoration; and also an office for the baptism of adults. On October 10th the King's letters were issued to the Archbishop of Canterbury, ordering him to cause his Convocation to institute a review of the Book of Common Prayer, and to make such alterations in it as they should think fit, and bring them before the King for his consideration. The second session of this Parliament began on November 20, and on the following day the Convocation of Canterbury met and at once appointed a committee of eight bishops, who were to take the work of revision in hand.

This work had been well advanced beforehand. The chief agent was Cosin, now Bishop of Durham, who had, for many years, kept notes of all the suggestions made for the improvement of the Prayer Book; and who, having acted as librarian to Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Overall, knew the opinion of those eminent divines on these subjects. Cosin had the coöperation of Wren, who had also given great attention to the questions raised; and his secretary

was Sancroft, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. Consequently the committee were soon able to report, and on Saturday, the 23d of November, a portion of the book with the suggested alterations was delivered to the Prolocutor, and the remainder on the following Wednesday. The alterations adopted by Convocation were entered by Sancroft in a folio Prayer Book of 1636; and after the work was completed, the whole was transcribed, compared with the book, and subscribed by both houses of Convocation, and by proxies from the Convocation of York, December 20, 1661.

The Houses of Parliament were growing impatient, the book being detained for a time by the King and Council. At last a copy confirmed under the Great Seal was delivered with a royal message to Parliament, February 25, 1662. The House of Lords then agreed to the Act of Uniformity, but with the revised book annexed, instead of the earlier one; and on the following day (March 18) they accepted the amended Prayer Book, giving thanks to Convocation for their care and labor. The House of Commons accepted the new book, and the royal assent was given May 19, 1662. As no fewer than six hundred alterations were made in this book, it would be impossible even to mention them here. Inasmuch, however, as our present Prayer Book is the result of the work then accomplished, and the last explicit testimony of the English Reformation, it is necessary to note the principal changes,¹ and to consider briefly their doctrinal and liturgical significance.

¹ These will be found at greater length in Procter's "History of the Book of Common Prayer."

The preface is said to have been written by Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, the original preface of 1549 being appended as a chapter, "Concerning the Service of the Church." With the exception of the Psalter, the Ten Commandments, the sentences at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Comfortable Words in the Communion Service, the passages of Scripture were taken from the "Authorized Version." The introductory part of the service was now prefixed to Evensong as well as Matins. "Priest" instead of "minister," was placed before the absolution. The prayer for the King and the collects following were printed in the order of Morning and Evening Service. "Rebellion" and "schism" were added in the Litany to the petition against "sedition." "Bishops, priests and deacons" were substituted for "bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church." Among the Occasional Prayers were added the two Ember Collects, the Prayer for Parliament, the Prayer for all conditions of men, the General Thanksgiving, and a Thanksgiving for the Restoration of public peace at home. Some new collects were added and changes made; for example, "Church" was put, in several places, for "Congregation." In the Communion Service, in the Prayer for the Church Militant, the last clause relating to the blessed dead was added. Directions were given for the presentation of the alms and the placing of the bread and wine upon the table before this prayer. Before the Prayer of Consecration a rubric was introduced directing the priest to order the bread and wine in a certain manner; also the directions for

consecrating additional bread and wine and for covering what was left over with a fair linen cloth. The order in Council (1552) respecting kneeling at communion, which had been removed at the Elizabethan revision, was now restored with alterations which will be presently considered. The catechism was separated from the order of confirmation, and the first rubric explaining the meaning of confirmation was appointed to be read as the preface to the service, followed by the renewal of the baptismal vow. In the marriage service, the rubric directing that "the new married persons, the same day of their marriage, must receive the Holy Communion" was altered to a declaration that it is convenient so to do, or at the first opportunity after their marriage. Some changes were also made in the Visitation of the Sick and the Communion of the Sick. In the order for burial, the rubric respecting persons unbaptized or excommunicated was added. The Communion Service was directed to be used on the first day in Lent. Forms of prayer were supplied to be used at sea; also for January 30, May 29, and November 5. The last of these was subsequently made also to commemorate the landing of Prince William of Orange; and all the three were removed from the Prayer Book in 1859.

We may differ in an estimate of the work which was accomplished by the revisers of 1661; but there is no difficulty in understanding its significance. It is obvious that no consideration was shown for the Puritans, and for this the revisers have been blamed. But it is easier to censure them than to prove that

anything which they could have done would have satisfied those men. They could not agree among themselves, their demands were exorbitant, and there was no sign, from beginning to end, that any concession on the part of the bishops would have been met by concessions on the other side. Mutual concessions were nearly as little understood in those days as mutual toleration; and however much we may regret the schism which was then made final, we have no reason to be surprised at such a result; and therefore it becomes us to believe that, as the Most High permitted the rending of the Hebrew Kingdom and its division into the Kingdoms of Judah and Israel, and thus worked out His own counsels; so these and other "our unhappy divisions" may and will by Him be overruled for the good of mankind and His own glory.

As regards the relations of parties within the Church, it cannot truly be said that a victory was gained by either side. Generally speaking, it is clear that the Elizabethan settlement was adopted; and this is shown not only by the retention of the two sentences in the administration of the Holy Communion, but in the retention or restoration of features from both the Prayer Books of Edward VI. Undoubtedly the tendency at the Restoration was what we should call upwards; but there was no intention shown to make it difficult for any one who had previously used the Prayer Book to continue to do so.

When the Prayer Book was introduced into the Scottish Church, the rubric relating to the north

side was altered to read "at the north side or end thereof;" and some attempt seems to have been made to have this alteration introduced in 1661. If this is so, the animus of the proposed alteration was probably the desire to fix the position of the altar at the east end; and the resistance to the change would equally arise from the hope of having the table again standing in the body of the Church. It is interesting to remark that, if the "High Church" suggestion had been adopted, the "Eastward Position" would have been positively prohibited by the rubric; whilst the "Low Church contention for north side left the position of the celebrant uncertain, and so made it possible to argue in favor of his standing before the table, as at least an allowable position.

The Ornaments rubric which was introduced from the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth has given rise to a great discrepancy of opinion and action; one party holding that it was intended to restore the vestments worn under the first Prayer Book, and the other that it was intended to order the surplice for ordinary parish churches and the cope on certain occasions for Cathedrals and Collegiate churches. The question is not so clear as some have assumed; but we may at least indicate the lines on which the argument must proceed.

On the one hand, there can be no question that the Elizabethan rubric restored the ornaments of 1549, and that practically the chasuble was never worn during the Queen's reign. It is also certain that whether the advertisements received the sanction of Elizabeth or not, they represent the ritual used

whilst she was Queen. It is argued by those who believe that the vestment, as distinguished from the cope, is legal, that its disuse from the Restoration no more proves its illegality than it did in the reign of Elizabeth; and that, now as then, the surplice represents a minimum of ritual, whilst a higher ritual is lawful.

It is impossible, and it is undesirable to present the arguments here at length; yet it may be pointed out that the case is now somewhat different. Whatever may be said of the Advertisements of Elizabeth, the same orders respecting the "ornaments of the minister" are given in the Canons of James; namely, that the surplice should be worn in parish churches, and in addition, the cope should be worn on special occasions in Cathedral and Collegiate churches. It would, therefore, appear that the rubric of 1661, requiring that the ornaments of the first year of Edward VI. should be retained, would be satisfied by the use of the cope, the Canons of James being assumed as explaining the rubric, and being obligatory on the Clergy. It is much to be regretted that the advice given by Dean Goulburn, preaching before the Church Congress at Wolverhampton, was not taken; namely, that both parties should agree to a friendly action in which the opposing arguments might be heard, and a decision arrived at. The course of the controversy has been, humanly speaking, most unfortunate, and, in view of the fact that several of the decisions of the Privy Council have been reversed, it can hardly be said to be settled.

The history of the so-called Black Rubric at the

end of the communion office may be noticed as a standing witness to the differences which emerged among those who were equally resolute in throwing off the domination of the papal see, and even in desiring a doctrinal reformation; and at the same time of the conciliatory and comprehensive spirit in which the Anglican formularies were drawn up. The changes have already, to some extent, been pointed out; but a few remarks on the final shape to which the rubric was reduced may form a fitting close to this brief history. It was clearly the intention of those who placed the rubric in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. to exclude all belief in the "Real Presence." It is probable that this phrase was, in their minds, representative of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. Theologians do not need to be told that the caution is inapplicable to the Lutheran doctrine, by whatever name it may be called. Consequently there was a certain ambiguity in the phraseology.

The rubric or note in the second Book of Edward VI. was evidently directed against Transubstantiation. But long before this time there had come into the Church the custom of speaking of a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, a form of speech unknown to the early Church; and afterwards there came to be a holding of a real presence which was not regarded as identical with the doctrine of Transubstantiation. For this reason, doubtless, it was that Elizabeth would not permit the retention of the note in Edward's book, which declared that it was not meant by the kneeling at Holy Communion

“that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood.” The spirit which dictated these lines was one of exclusiveness, or else a desire to court the growing Protestant party. Elizabeth, on the contrary, was hoping to build up a church from which none should be excluded, and she regarded the extreme Protestant party with dislike and suspicion.

The Church had passed through various experiences before the time of the last revision. Apparently Sheldon, Cosin, and their coadjutors did not think it quite safe to omit this rubric altogether. Suspicion was afloat that there was an intention of allowing a general toleration, in order to include the Roman Catholics, similar to the attempt afterwards made by James II.; and the bishops well knew that the Puritans would take advantage of such a state of the public mind, in order to create or strengthen prejudices against the Church. For this and other reasons, they restored the rubric, but with a considerable modification of the part, quoted above, on the adoration of the Sacrament, which was made to read as follows: “It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine, there bodily received, or to any *Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood.*” The time had gone by when it could be hoped that believers in Transubstantiation might be won to remain within the Church established; and if the England of the Restoration

had come to detest Puritanism, it had come no nearer to the love of Romanism, as the passing of the test acts may abundantly demonstrate. Here, then, the Church of England takes her position, doing her best to stand upon the old ways, holding to the ancient principles of the Church, but refusing to identify mediæval dogmas with primitive beliefs, and also refusing, under the pretext of loyalty to the Scriptures, to disregard the early customs and traditions of the Apostolic Church.

As we look back over nearly a century and a half which has elapsed since Henry VIII. began his conflict with the Bishop of Rome, the eye falls upon many a scene which fills the heart of the beholder with gratitude and hope, if there are also incidents that awaken sorrow, shame, and apprehension. Yet we have before us the record of a series of events, which, taken as a whole, may well make the child of the Anglican Communion proud of his spiritual descent. If the figures which stand out before us are seldom heroic, it would be difficult to find, in any similar period of the history of mankind, and within the same compass, an equal number of men so highly distinguished by calm intelligence, extensive learning, a deep and sincere sense of duty to God and man, and a resolute and self-sacrificing devotion to the work to which they believed themselves called by the Providence and Spirit of God.

INDEX.

- Abbot, Archbishop, relations to James, 383, life sketched, 383, 384, appointment to Canterbury unfortunate, 384, persecutions, 384 sq., conscientiousness, 386, "Book of Sports," 387, waning influence, 388, remonstrance to king, 389, condemns Montagu, 390, influence of Laud, 391 sq., death and character, 392, refusal to license Sibthorp's sermon, 397, king recalls to court, 397, wears cope, 405.
- Absolution, 386.
- Act of Henry IV. against heretics revived, 207.
- Act of Succession, 84, 183.
- Act of Supremacy, 232, 291.
- Act of Uniformity, First, 133 sq., Second, 162, 163, Elizabethan, 258, 259, 260, 307, 368, Charles II., 451.
- Admonition, first and second, 316.
- Advertisements, the, 305 sq., 455, 456.
- Agatho, Pope, 6.
- Alexander III. advises Becket to yield to king, 23.
- Alexander IV. claims first fruits, 23.
- Alexander VI., character, 50, 51.
- Altar, destruction, 157, disappearance of word from Prayer-Book, 171, Injunctions, 263, position of, 405, 455. See
- Laud; Parliament, Long; Communion, Holy; Council.
- Anabaptists, persecuted, 83, 148, errors condemned in Articles, 297, 298, variety, 327, 328.
- Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, 365, Authorized Version, 377, mentioned for Canterbury, 383, leadership, 388.
- Anglican orders, validity of. See Parker, Matthew.
- Anglican, Reformation, special characteristics, 1 sq., rejection of papal supremacy, 2, impulse of Renaissance, 57 sq., relations of sovereign and people, 100, leaders not eclectics or mediators, 104, principles, 152, influence of continental Protestants, 155 sq., 342 sq., consequence under Edward VI., 179, Westminster Abbey conference, 255 sq., in earnest, 263 sq. See England, Church of; Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., Cranmer, Parker, Jewel, Abbot, Laud, Hooker, Richard; Act of Uniformity, Articles, Communion, Holy; Bible, Ordinal, Parliament, Long; Prayer-Book, Restoration, and other titles at end of England, Church of.
- Anne of Cleves, 111.
- Anselm of Canterbury, quarrel with William Rufus, 14, with

- Henry I., 14 sq., enforcement of celibacy, 16.
- Antinomianism, 302.
- Apocrypha, 367.
- "Apologia" of Jewel, 282, 284, 285, 286.
- "Apostolicæ Curæ," 275.
- "Appelo Cæsarem," 396, 398.
- Arminians and Arminianism, 292, 343, 390, 397, 398.
- Arthur, brother of Henry VIII., 71.
- Arthur, summoned for heresy, 70.
- Article, XVII. not Calvinistic, 345.
- Articles, Eleven, 300, 301.
- Articles, Fifteen, 319.
- Articles, Forty-two (or Forty-five), 177, 287, 292.
- Articles, Lambeth, 343 sq., 367, 398.
- Articles, Six, 108 sq., modified, 113, repealed, 127.
- Articles, Ten, 103 sq.
- Articles, Thirty-nine, 177, 287, 292 sq., 301 sq., made law, 313, subscribed, 370.
- Articles, Twenty-four, 331.
- Arundel, Archbishop, 46, on pilgrimages, 53.
- Aske, Robert, 95.
- Askew, Anne, 118.
- Assembly, Scotch General, 410.
- Audley, Sir Thomas, 92.
- Augsburg, Confession of, 107, 298.
- Augustine, missionary to England, 3.
- Augustine, St., 343.
- Auricular Confession, 109. See Penance.
- Bacon, Lady, translator of "Apologia," 286.
- Bacon, Sir Nicholas, lord chancellor, 253, president of Westminster Abbey Conference, 255, 256, relations to Parker, 266, rebuked by Parker, 317.
- Bale, Bishop, consecration of Parker, 267.
- Bancroft, Archbishop, on Episcopacy, 340, Hampton Court Conference, 365 sq., convocation of Canterbury, 370, chosen archbishop, 371, sketch of life, 372, severity, 372-373, sermon at Paul's Cross on Episcopacy, 372, collision with common law courts, 374, 375, Authorized Version, 376, death and character, 381, 382.
- Baptism, defined in Ten Articles, 103, ritual changed in Second Book, 166, 167, sign of cross, 287, regeneration, 288, changes in ritual, 301, Hooker's view, 358, lay, 287, 366.
- Baptists, 327, toleration for, 443.
- Barlow, Bishop, Parker's consecration, 267, 269, 271, 272, record of consecration, 272, 273.
- Barlow, Dean of Chester, on Hampton Court Conference, 366.
- Baro, Peter, assails Lambeth Articles, 345.
- Barret, denial of indefectibility of faith, 343.
- Barrow and Barrowists, 327.
- Barton, Elizabeth, "Nun of Kent," 83, 84.
- Baxter, Richard, opposes requirement of Solemn League and Covenant, 425, influence of, 443, "Reformed Liturgy," 445.
- Beale, clerk of council, 331.
- Becket, Thomas, relations to Henry II., 21 sq., effect of murder, 23, 24, cult, 97, 98.
- Bedingfield, Sir Henry, 245.
- Benedictines, 52.
- Benedictines of St. Maur, 52.
- Benefit of clergy, 65, 66.
- Berengarius opposes Transubstantiation, 43.
- Bertha, wife of Ethelbert, 3.

- Bertram, treatise on Eucharist, 143.
- Beza, influence on Cartwright, 316.
- Bible, translations of, 42, 83, Matthew's, 106, 288, "Great," 106, 289, 375, 376, set up in churches, 106, 107, "Paraphrase" of Erasmus, 126, burned at Oxford, 240, Tynedale's, 288, Coverdale's, 83, 106, 288, Elizabethan period, 288, 289, Genevan, 289, 375, 376, 379, German New Testament, 289, Bishop's, 290, 375, 376, paramount as to doctrine, 361, Authorized Version, 375 sq., Roman Catholic versions, 376.
- Bill of Treasons, 207.
- Bilney burned, 70.
- Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, "Perpetual Government," 341, at Hampton Court Conference, 365.
- Bishop's Bible, 290, 375, 376.
- Bishop's Book, 106, 119.
- Black Rubric, 174, 259, 456 sq.
- Bocher, Anne, 118.
- Bocher, Joan, 143, 144.
- Bocking, Canon of Canterbury, 83, 84.
- Boleyn, Anne, 72, divorce and execution, 102.
- Boleyn, Mary, 72.
- Bond, Dr., candidate for mastership of Temple, 332.
- Bonner, upholds royal supremacy, 82, 86, raised to episcopate, 110, on changes, 126, orders from Council, 141, imprisoned, 145, succeeded by Ridley, 155, position under Mary, 186, tumult at St. Paul's, 187, persecutions, 206 sq., 210, 212, 214, 215, papal delegate to carry our degradation of Cranmer, 225 sq., coldness of Elizabeth, 249, treatment under Elizabeth, 262, death, 262, Nag's Head, 269, Act of Supremacy, 291.
- "Book of Discipline," 329, 335, 336.
- "Book of Sports," 387, 402, 410.
- Bosa of York, 7.
- Bossuet, on variations of Protestantism, 192.
- Bound, on Sabbath observance, 341.
- Bourne, Chaplain to Bonner, 187, Parker's consecration, 267.
- Brandon, Charles, 182.
- Brandon, Frances, 182.
- Breda, Declaration of, 434, 440, 443.
- British Church, 3 sq.
- Brookes, Bishop of Gloucester, trial of Cranmer, 216, 217, of Ridley and Latimer, 218 sq.
- Brown, Robert, 325, 326.
- Brownists, 325 sq., Hooker in opposition, 361, at Westminster Assembly, 428.
- Bucer, Martin, 142, influence, 148, 150, relations to Hooper, 156, "Censure," 159, body exhumed and burned, 240.
- Buchanan, George, teacher of James I., 365.
- Buckeridge, Bishop, defends Montagu, 396.
- Buckingham, Duke of, supports Andrewes, 383, influence of Williams, 388, expedition, 389, friend of Laud, 395, rupture with Williams, 396, death and character, 398.
- Bullinger, 156, 160, on vestments, 309.
- Burial Service, changes in Second Book, 168.
- Burleigh, Lord, 131, succession of Edward VI., 184, 249, relations to Parker, 277, Articles, 296, on ritual irregularities, 305, rebuked by Parker, 317, intercedes for Brown, 326, opposition to Whitgift, 331,

- 333, on Lambeth Articles, 344, 345.
- Burnet, on Cromwell, 111, on Cranmer, 116, on Gardiner, 116, on Catharine Parr, 117, on Gardiner's sermon, 131, 132, on ritual practices, time of First Book, 141, on Eucharistic controversy, 143, on Heath, 153, on persecutions, 238, on imprisonment of bishops under Elizabeth, 257.
- Butts, Dr., Henry VIII.'s physician, 114, 116.
- Calais, loss of, 244.
- Calixtus II., consecrates Thurston to York, 17.
- Calvin, Calvinism, view of Real Presence, 142, writes' against Prayer-Book, 239, Articles not Calvinistic, 292, contrasted with Cranmer, 294, influence of, 342 sq., disciple of Augustine, 343, Article XVII., 345, Hooker's position, 361, James favors, 384, James against, 388 sq., under Charles I., 397 sq. See Presbyterians.
- Cambridge, University of, on divorce of Henry and Catharine, 76, on royal supremacy, 82, controversy concerning Transubstantiation, 143; visitation under Pole, 240; Puritan stronghold, 310.
- Camden, on policy of Elizabethan reformers, 251.
- Campeggio, papal legate, 74.
- Campion, Jesuit missionary, 347, 348.
- Canons, under James I., 370, 371.
- Canterbury, relations to York, 17, 19, archbishop, papal legate, 25, Convocation of 1604, 370.
- Cardinals' College, 69.
- Carew, Sir Peter, rebellion, 199.
- Carlisle, Statute of, 32.
- Carr, Robert, 386.
- Carthusians, 52.
- Cartwright, Thomas, 316, Second Admonition, 316, second reply to Whitgift and flight, 317, "Book of Discipline," 329, 426, refuses to take oath, 338.
- Catechism, Cranmer's, 132, condemned by Convocation under Mary, 196, under Elizabeth, 290, Longer and Shorter, 424.
- Catesby, Robert, 374.
- Catharine of Aragon, 61, 71 sq., divorce quashed by Mary's Parliament, 194, Cranmer forced to recant errors concerning divorce, 233.
- Catharine of Medici, 314.
- Cavalier's Parliament, 448.
- Cecil, Sir William. See Burleigh.
- Celibacy, 11, 13, 16; actions against married clergy, 108 sq., punishment reduced, 112, removed, 140, Injunctions, 263, under Elizabeth, 281.
- Ceremonies, Cranmer on, 359, Hooker on, 359, 361. See Ritual.
- Chaderton, Hampton Court Conference, 364.
- Chalcedon, Council of, on Roman see, 3.
- Chantries, assignment of property to king, 124, 127.
- Charles I., reasons for popular antagonism to, 374, supports Andrewes, 383, expedition to Spain, 389, influence of Laud, 391 sq., coronation, 392, interposes for Montagu, 396, absolutism, 396 sq., recalls Abbot to court, 397, "Instructions," 399, relations to Calvinists, 398, 400, Book of Sports, 402, 410, Scotch Prayer-Book, 406 sq., yields to Scotch rebellion, 410, dissolves Parliament of

- 1640, 411, action of Convocation, 411, 412, Long Parliament, 414 sq., weakness without Laud's support, 418, lack of people's trust, 418 sq., Grand Remonstrance, 419, consents to degradation of bishops, 420, 421, action against Pym, Hampden, etc., 421 sq., leaves Whitehall, 422, condemns use of Directory, 427, 428, refuses to establish Presbyterianism, 433, execution, 433, 434. See England, Church of; Laud.
- Charles II., Declaration of Breda, 439, 440, accession, 441, conference with Puritans, 443, 444, Savoy conference, 444, sq., second Parliament, 447 sq.
- Charles V., Emperor, 74, 108, policy toward England, 197, 198.
- Charles IX., St. Bartholomew, 314.
- Charter of Henry I., 22, 27.
- Charter House, 386.
- Cheke, Sir John, 296.
- Chester, Bishop of, on "Prophecies," 323.
- Chichele, Archbishop, letter of Martin V. to, 47.
- Christ Church, priory of, dissolved, 92.
- Church property, 90 sq., 224, 261, 317, 319, 332, Hooker's views on sequestration of, 360.
- Cistercians, 52.
- Clarendon, Constitutions of, 22, 23, 27, non-enforcement, 24.
- Clarendon. See Hyde, Edward.
- Classis*, 329.
- Clement VI., provision of, 33.
- Clement XII., on "Ecclesiastical Policy," 354.
- "Clericis laicos," 32.
- Clugny, 52.
- Cluniacs, 52.
- Coke, Sir Edward, 374, 385, 386, 387.
- Cole, Dr., Westminster Abbey Conference, 256, sermon at Cranmer's death, 235.
- Colet, John, 57, 58, on state of clergy, 65.
- Colleges, assignment of property to king, 124, 127.
- Colman, on Easter controversy, 4.
- Common Prayer-Book. See Prayer-Book.
- Commonwealth, 435 sq.
- Communion, Holy, in both kinds, 109, 127, 301, office of Cranmer, 128, 129, opposition and acts to enforce, 129, office in First Book, 136 sq., substitution of tables for altars, 158, 171, Cranmer's views, 143, 161, 162, changes in Second Book, 168 sq., discussions at Oxford under Mary, 200, 202, homilies on, 288, articles on, 302, 303, Hooker's views, 358, Black Rubric, 174, 259, 456 sq. See Transubstantiation, Real Presence.
- Confession. See Auricular Confession, Penance.
- Confession of Faith, Presbyterian, 424, 429.
- Confirmation, 366.
- Congé d'élire, abolished, 127, present practice, 127, 254.
- Congregationalists, 325.
- Constance, Council of, exhumation of Wyclif's remains, 44.
- Constantinople, Council of, on Roman see, 3.
- Constitutions of Clarendon, 22, 23, 27, non-enforcement, 24.
- Consubstantiation, 142.
- "Consultation" of Hermann, 129, 136.
- Convention Parliament. See Parliament.
- Convocation of 1536, 102, irreg-

- ular, of York, 105, under Elizabeth, 253, 255, of 1563, 286, 287, 300, 301, of 1571, 300, 301, of York of 1604, 371. For others, see England, Church of.
- Cook, Hugh, Abbot of Reading, 95.
- Cooper, Bishop, on Marprelate controversy, 336, 338.
- Cosin, Bishop, 415, Prayer-Book revision, 450.
- Council, Privy, Edward VI.'s minority, 123 sq., 128 sq., 144, orders removal of altars, 158, orders Articles, 295 sq., under Elizabeth, 330 sq. See England, Church of.
- Councils, General, 255, 288, 298.
- Court of High Commission, 262, 264.
- Courtenay, Bishop of London, quarrel with Gaunt, 40, trial of Wyclif, 44.
- Courtenay, Earl of, 194, 199, Philip's intercession, 203.
- Covenant. See Solemn League and Covenant.
- Coverdale, Miles, translation of Bible, 83, 106, 189, 288, 289, Parker's consecration, 267, 269.
- Cox, Richard, first Prayer-Book, 133, committee to revise Prayer-Book, 252, consecration, 276, preface to homilies, 287, work on Bible, 290, revision of Articles, 301 sq., on Puritans, 318, 319, letter to Burleigh on "Propheysings," 322, Bishop's Bible, 376.
- Cranmer, Thomas, characteristics, 75, divorce of Henry and Catharine, 75, 76, divorce of Anne Boleyn, 102, Matthew's Bible, 106, Lutheran views, 108, Six Articles, 109, obliged to send away his wife, 110, on Cromwell, 110, attacked, 113 sq., prepares English version of Litany, 119, guidance of Edward, 120, 123, seconds Somerset's changes, 124, conservative position, 124, 125, relations to Gardiner, 126, petition of clergy for legislative privileges, 127, 128, new communion office, 128, 129, opposition and acts to enforce, 129, catechism, 132, first Prayer-Book, 133, brings Bucer to Cambridge, 142, 150, views on Eucharist, 143, 161, 162, Joan of Kent, 144, defeats rebellion against Council, 144, relations to Hooper, 156, reform of Mass, 157, second Prayer-Book, 158 sq., 162, fairness, 162, opposes Black Rubric, 174, Articles, 177, succession to Edward VI., 187, difficulties under Mary, 190, 191, sent to Tower, 192, found guilty of treason, 196, 197, Eucharistic discussion at Oxford, 200-202, punishment suggested by Mary, 212, petition to queen in behalf of, 213, reasons for postponement of punishment, 215, cited to appear before pope, 216, defence in University Church, 216-218, at time of Ridley's and Latimer's execution, 220, influence of Ridley, 222, excommunicated, 225, degradation, 225 sq., appeal, 227 sq., hope of escape, 229 sq., personal worth and defects, 230, 231, submission to papal party, 231 sq., removed to deanery of Christ Church, 232, no reason against believing in his final courage, 234, recants recantation and death, 235 sq., final summing up, 237, 238, liturgical work, 238, leader in reform, 249 sq., on ceremonies, 359.
- Crome dissents from Six Articles, 109.

- Cromwell, Oliver, first recorded utterance, 398, an Independent, 428, 429, "Triers," 436, 437, absolutism, 437, death, 438, work, 440.
- Cromwell, Thomas, 75, policy, 81, 88, 91, murder, 110, characteristics, 111, 112.
- Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury, 400.
- Davis, Bishop, of St. Asaph, 276.
- Day, Bishop, imprisoned, 158, sermon at Edward's funeral, 187.
- "Defence of Proceedings against Heretics," 214.
- "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," 161.
- De Grey, Bishop of Norwich, 25.
- "De heretico comburendo," 46.
- Della Mirandola, Pico, 57.
- Denmark, prince proposes marriage to Elizabeth, 246.
- De Noailles on effect of persecutions, 209, picture of Mary's last days, 244.
- Dering, Sir Edward, attacks Laud, 415, Root and Branch bill, 417.
- De Testa, William, 32.
- Devon, Earl of. See Courtenay.
- Devonshire, Earl of, 393.
- "Directory of Public Worship," 332, under Long Parliament, 426, 427, condemned by Charles, 427, 428.
- "Discipline." See Book of Discipline.
- Dissenters, 309, 311 sq., Elizabeth's attitude toward, 314 sq. See under separate names.
- Dominicans, 30, 31, 52.
- Dominion, theory of, 39-41.
- Dort, Synod of, 387, 389.
- Douai Old Testament, 376.
- Dudley, Earl of Warwick. See Northumberland.
- Dudley, Lord Guildford, 182, found guilty of treason, 196, death, 199.
- Dunbar, Earl of, 383.
- Dunstan applies to Rome for pall, 9, reasons, 10.
- Eadmer, on compromise between Henry and Anselm, 15.
- Easter controversy, 4.
- Easterfield, Council of, 8.
- Eastward position, 455.
- "Ecclesiastical Policy." See Hooker.
- Edward I., accession, 30, Statute of Mortmain, 31, "clericis laicos," 32, Statute of Carlisle, 32.
- Edward II., weakness, 33.
- Edward III., complaints to papal see, 33, feudal tribute, 38, demands subsidies for war, 39, suspends Statute of Provisors, 39.
- Edward VI., guidance of, 120, reign, 122 sq., Joan of Kent, 144, urges revision of Prayer-Book, 160, death, 162, 176, 184, Articles, 177, 295 sq., charitable work, 180, 181, piety and ability, 181, relations to Mary, 182, to Lady Jane Grey and Elizabeth, 182, 183, influence of Ridley, 222. See Council.
- Edward the Confessor, 11.
- Edwin, King, 4.
- Egfrid imprisons Wilfrid, 6.
- Elizabeth, born, 78, declared illegitimate, 102, set aside by Edward VI., 183, result of quashing divorce of Henry and Catharine, 194, harsh treatment from Mary, 194, suspected of rebellion, 199, in Tower, 199, intercession of Philip, 203, 204, during Mary's reign, 245 sq., marriage proposals, 246, 253, 254, accession, 248, early policy, 249, religious attitude,

- 250 sq., first Parliament, 252 sq., convocation, in opposition, 255, Injunctions, 262-264, royal supremacy, 263, relations to Parker, 265 sq., 279, 299, on non-juring bishops, 277, 278, relations to papacy, 278, 279, to extreme reformers, 279 sq., marriage of clergy, 281, approval of Jewel's work, 286, orders Bible set up in churches, 289, ritual irregularities, 306 sq., Thirty-nine Articles, 313, opposed to ecclesiastical bills, 313, 314, on St. Bartholomew, 314, rebuked by Parker, 317, church properties, 317, 319, 332, influence of Leicester, 319, Fifteen Articles, 319, "Propheysings," 320 sq., effect of policy on Church, 333 sq., on Lambeth Articles, 344, relations to Roman Catholics, 346 sq., excommunicated, 346, 347, personal danger, 348, death and debt to, 349.
- "Engagement," 435, 436.
- England, Church of, early history, 2 sq., Peter's pence, 8, influence of Theodore of Tarsus, 5 sq., of Dunstan, 9, 10, of Edward the Confessor, 11, under William the Conqueror, 12 sq., William Rufus, 14, Henry I., 14 sq., Synod at Westminster, 18, relations to Canterbury and York, 17-19, 25, under Stephen, 20, Henry II., 21 sq., effect of murder of Becket, 24, case of Langton, 25 sq., Magna Charta, 27, influence of Simon de Montfort, 27, under Henry III., 27 sq., papal provisions, 28, 29, under Edward I., 30 sq., Statute of Mortmain, 31, "clericis laicos," 32, Statute of Carlisle, 32, under Edward II., 33, Edward III., 33, Wyclif, 37 sq., 41 sq., Urban V. demands feudal tribute, 38, "Good Parliament," 39, "De heretico comburendo," 46, fifteenth century, 49 sq., impulse of Renaissance, 57 sq., under Henry VIII., 61 sq., 71 sq., 79 sq., "Erastianism," 62, royal supremacy, 67, 81, 82, movements against Rome at first political and social, 67, sympathy with Luther, 67, policy of Cromwell, 81, 88, suppression of religious houses, 90 sq., insurrections, 95, pilgrimage of grace, 95, Ten Articles, 103 sq., irregular convocation of York, 105, Six Articles, 108 sq., 113, repealed, 127, "King's Book," 119, English version of Litany, 119, reign of Edward VI., 122 sq., royal supremacy under Edward VI., 124, visitations under Somerset, 125, 126, reformers between two fires, 130, persecution of Anabaptists, 143, continental Protestant influence, 155 sq., destruction of altars, 157, 158, consequences of Reformation under Edward VI., 179, reign of Mary, 181, 182, 185 sq., 198, religious discussions prohibited, 188, result, 188 sq., foreign reformers expelled, 192, negotiations with Rome, 197, new epoch marked by marriage of Philip and Mary, 203 sq., reconciliation with Rome, 204, 205, property formerly alienated remains undisturbed, 205, 206, persecutions, 206 sq., 212 sq., 241, act of Henry IV. against heretics revived, 207, Bill of Treasons, 207, effect, 209, 215, number burned, 213, new Parliament, 223, property restored to Church, 224, Frank-

fort colony, 239, visitation of universities, 240, 241, failures of Mary, 243, 244, accession of Elizabeth, 248 sq., first Parliament, 252 sq., royal supremacy under Elizabeth, 254, 301, 302, convocation in opposition, 255, Westminster Abbey Conference, 255 sq., reversion of church property, 261, reformation in earnest, 262 sq., Injunctions, 262-264, act of Parliament legalizing consecration of new bishops, 273, 274, Advertisements, 305 sq., ecclesiastical bills defeated, 314, "Prophesyings," 320 sq., Brownists, 325-327, Presbyterians and Independents, 327, Puritans in church, 328 sq., 333 sq., 339 sq., Marprelate controversy, 336, effect of Calvinism, 343 sq., Lambeth Articles, 343 sq., Parliament of 1571 *vs.* Rome, 347, recusancy laws, 347 sq., under James I., 363 sq., Hampton Court Conference, 364 sq., convocation of Canterbury, 370, canons, 370, 371, under Charles I. and Laud, 391 sq., Scotch outburst against Episcopacy, 409, 410, Long Parliament, 414 sq., canons of convocation attacked, 415, committee to revise ritual and doctrine, 416 sq., Root and Branch bill, 417, 418, 423, Grand Remonstrance, 419, escape of bishops, 420, their degradation, 420, 421, Scotch intervention, 423, Westminster Assembly, 424 sq., Solemn League and Covenant imposed, 424 sq., tyranny of Puritans, 426 sq., "Directory," 426 sq., anarchy after death of Charles, 435 sq., "Engagement," 435 sq., "Triers," 436, 437, Declara-

tion of Breda, 439, 440, Restoration, 441 sq., conference with Puritans, 443, 444, Savoy Conference, 444 sq., second Parliament of Charles, 447 sq., the old ways, 459. See Act of Uniformity, Communion, Holy; Articles, Constitutions of Clarendon, Parliament, Prayer-Book, Ordinal, Convocation, Provisors, Præmunire, Bible, Real Presence, Homilies, Episcopacy, Puritans, Ritual, Cranmer, Cartwright, Bonner, Gardiner, Grindal, Latimer, Ridley, Hooker, Whitgift, Laud, Parker, Pole, Jewel, Grey, Lady Jane; Wyclif, Wilfrid, Papacy, and individual names of monarchs.

Episcopacy, Bancroft and Bilson on, 340, 341, arguments of Elizabethan reformers, 356, 357, controversies under Charles I., 417, 418, under commonwealth, 435 sq., Restoration, 442.

Erasmus, sketch of life, 53, "Eucheiridion," 58, 59, "Praise of Folly," 58, differences with Luther, 59, "Paraphrase," 126.

Erastianism, 128.

Essex, Countess of, divorced, 386.

Ethelbert, 3.

Fagius, body exhumed and burned, 240.

Fairfax joins Monk, 439.

Falkland against Presbyterian despotism, 419.

"Family of Love," 327, 328.

Fawkes, Guy, 375.

Felton, John, 398.

Ferrar, Bishop of St. David's, burned, 212.

Ficino, 57.

Field, admonition to Parliament,

- 316, at Hampton Court Conference, 365.
- Fisher, Bishop, confessor of Catharine, 73, 74, defends purgatory, 79, belief in "Nun of Kent," 83, 84, refuses oath to succession of children of Anne Boleyn, 84, animosity of Henry, 84, 85, cardinal, 85, death, 85.
- Fisher, the Jesuit, controversy with Laud, 393.
- "Fortunes of Nigel," picture of James I., 365.
- Fox, on divorce of Henry and Catharine, 74, presents Ten Articles, 103.
- France, peace recommended under Elizabeth, 252.
- Franciscans, 30, 31.
- Frankfort, English colony at, 239.
- French type, Reformation, 239.
- Friends, 328.
- Froude, on Henry VIII., 61.
- Fryth, John, suspected of Lutheranism, 79, imprisoned, 79, burned, 80.
- Fuller, on abuses of Reformation, 180, on Hooker, 352, 354, on position of altar, 405.
- Gardiner, on divorce of Catharine and Henry, 74, upholds royal supremacy, 82, 86, 87, attacks Catharine Parr, 116; fall from favor, 117-119, defends customs in use, 125, 126, imprisoned, 126, at liberty, 130, allied with reactionaries, 130, sermon before king, 130, 131, imprisoned again, 131, view of ordinal, 154, succeeded by Parker, 155, answer to Cranmer's treatise on Eucharist, 163, satisfaction with first Prayer-Book, 176, position under Mary, 186, lord chancellor, 188, advocates mild measures with Cranmer, 191, opposes proposed legateship of Pole, 197, anti-papal but not Protestant, 198, marries Philip and Mary, 202, hatred of Elizabeth, 203, connection with persecutions, 206 sq., irritated by republication of his book on True Obedience, 208, sick of persecutions, 210, lays blame on queen, 212, death and characteristics, 223, record of consecration, 273.
- General Assembly, Scotch, 410.
- Geneva. See Reformation.
- Genevan Bible. See Bible.
- Germany, Reformation in, 56, 57, 302, 328, Henry VIII.'s relations to, 107 sq.
- Glastonbury, dissolution of abbey, 98.
- Good, Dr., charges Baro with heresy, 345.
- "Good Parliament," 39.
- Good works, 302.
- Goodrich, Bishop, first Prayer-Book, 123.
- Gosnald, Judge, 183.
- Goulburn, Dean, on ritual differences, 456.
- Grand Remonstrance, 419.
- Great Bible. See Bible.
- Greek Church, view of Eucharist, 142.
- Gregory VII., relations to William the Conqueror, 12, 13.
- Gregory XIII., "Te Deum" for St. Bartholomew, 314.
- Gregory the Great, English mission, 3.
- Grey, Lady Jane, 182-184, found guilty of treason, 196, death, 199.
- Grindal, commissioner to revise Prayer-Book, 252, consecration, 276, Articles, 296, criticism of Elizabeth, 315, remains in church, 315, succeeds to Canterbury, 318, character,

- 318, 324, Fifteen Articles, 319,
 "Prophecyings," 321, sus-
 pended, 321, 322, restored, 323,
 death, 323, 324.
- Grocyn, 58.
- Grosseteste, Robert, on papal
 provisions, 29, letter to Inno-
 cent, 29.
- Guest, Prayer-Book revision,
 257, consecrated to Rochester,
 276, work on Scriptures, 290,
 Articles, 301 sq., Bishop's
 Bible, 376.
- Gunpowder Plot, 374.
- Gunning, Puritan action against,
 438.
- Hackett, on Barlow, 382.
- Hadrian, Pope, on Peter's Pence,
 8.
- Hales, Judge, 183, 189.
- Hall, Joseph, 388, on Long Par-
 liament Commission, 417, de-
 fence of Episcopacy, 417, in
 custody, 420, persecution, 430.
- Hallam, on treatment of Roman
 Catholics, 349, on Hooker, 354,
 on legality of expelled bishops'
 protest, 420.
- Hamilton, consecration to Gal-
 loway, 380.
- Hampden, charged with treason,
 421.
- Hampton Court Conference, 364
 sq.
- Harding, on Parker, 263.
- Hardwick, on Articles, 294, 299.
- Harold, King, 11.
- Hawley, Bishop of Hereford, 193.
- Haynes, Dr., first Prayer-Book,
 133.
- Heath, Bishop of Worcester, 153,
 154.
- Heath, Archbishop of York, an-
 nounces accession of Elizabeth,
 248, treatment by Elizabeth,
 262, remonstrance to Parker,
 278.
- Henrietta Maria, 391, 421.
- Henry I., kingly rights, 15, Eng-
 lish liberties diminished, 19,
 relation to popes, 15 sq., char-
 ter of, 22, 27.
- Henry II., 21 sq.
- Henry III., parliamentary re-
 form, 27 sq.
- Henry IV., destruction of Lol-
 lardism, 46, act of, against
 heretics revived, 207.
- Henry VIII., character, 61, 62,
 divorce of Catharine, 62, 71 sq.,
 attractive qualities, 63, 64,
 rights of crown, 67, 76, 81, 82,
 101, reply to Luther, 68, double
 course, 79, Succession and
 Treason Acts, 84, animosity to
 Fisher and More, 84, 85, ex-
 communicated, 86, 98, judicial
 murder of Countess of Salis-
 bury, 86, 112, relations to
 Pole, 86, 87, his supremacy an
 autocracy, 87-89, suppression
 of religious houses, 90 sq., not
 the first in this field, 92, insur-
 rections, 95, pilgrimage of
 grace, 95, not friend of German
 Reformation, 101, reactionary,
 101, 108, marries Jane Sey-
 mour, 102, sanctions "Institu-
 tion" and Matthew's Bible, 106,
 relations to foreign reformers,
 107 sq., against Lambert, 108,
 Six Articles, 103 sq., murder
 of Cromwell, 110; relations to
 Cranmer, 113 sq., to Catharine
 Parr, 116 sq., "King's Book,"
 119, English version of Litany,
 119, will, 119, 120, arrest of
 Norfolk and Surrey, 120,
 death, 120, summary of Bur-
 net, 120, anti-papal, but Ro-
 man, 121, arranges succession,
 122.
- Henry, Prince of Wales, 384.
- Hereford, Nicholas, translation
 of Old Testament, 42.
- Hermann, "Consultation," 129,
 136.

- Hertford, Council at (673), 5.
 Hertford, Lord. See Somerset.
 Heylin, on Marprelate controversy, 337, on state of church under Charles I., 399.
 High Commission, Court of, abolished, 419, Cavalier Parliament, 449.
 Hildebrand, relations to William the Conqueror, 12, 13.
 Hodgkins, Bishop, Parker's consecration, 267, 269.
 Holbeach, Bishop, first Prayer-Book, 133.
 Holy Communion. See Communion.
 Holyman, Bishop, trial of Latimer and Ridley, 218 sq.
 Homage, 13, 15, 16.
 Homilies, 126, second book, 287, 288.
 Honorius III., reverses action of Innocent, 27.
 Hoods, 263.
 Hook, Dean, on James I., 365.
 Hooker, John, 350.
 Hooker, Richard, position of, 317, master of Temple, 332, sketch of life, 350 sq., controversy with Travers, 351, 352, characteristics, 352, 353, "Ecclesiastical Policy," 352, 353, Fuller and Hallam on style, 353, 354, Walton on, 354, object and germ of work, 354 sq., sermon on Pride, 354, on Episcopacy, 356, 357, on Sacraments, 358, on Ceremonies, 359, 361, on Sundays and Holy Days, 360, on Church Property and Consecrated Places, 360, 361, on Scriptures, 361, on Divine Decrees, 361, great influence, 362.
 Hooker, Mrs. Richard, 351, 353.
 Hooper, Protestantism, 156, destruction of altars, 157, imprisoned, 189, refuses to take part in eucharistic discussion, 202, tried, 208, burned, 209, reconciliation with Ridley, 210, 211, Articles, 295.
 Horne, Westminster Abbey Conference, 256, controversy with Bonner, 269, Articles, 296.
 Horsey, murder of Hunne, 66.
 Houson, Bishop, defends Montagu, 396.
 Howard, Catharine, 111.
 Howard, Henry, execution, 120.
 Howe, Bishop of Winchester, 291.
 Huber, Archbishop, 25.
 Hume, on Treatment of Roman Catholics, 349.
 Hunne, Richard, murder, 66.
 Huss, influence of Wyclif, 42.
 Hyde, Edward, relations to Laud, 400, 401, on Scotch Prayer-Book, 409, against Presbyterian despotism, 419, conference at Worcester House, 443.
 Images, destruction of, 97, Ten Articles on, 104, Ridley recommends destruction, 125, ordered removed, 126, 130, Cranmer's views, 132, Guest on, 257, Elizabeth on, 263, Jewel's challenge, 285, Eleven Articles, 301.
 Independents, 325, 327, at Westminster Assembly, 428, 429, "Engagement," 435, 436, toleration for, 443.
 Indulgences, 54.
 Injunctions, 262-264.
 Innocent III., elects Langton to archbishopric, 25, puts England under interdict, 26, victory over John, 26, relations to Magna Charta, 27, feudatory tribute from John, 38.
 Innocent IV., papal provisions, 29.
 Innocent VIII., character, 50.
 "Institution of a Christian Man," 106, 119.

- Intention, doctrine of, 274 sq.
 Investiture, 13, 15, 16.
 Invocation of saints. See Saints.
 Ireland. See Laud.
 Italy, Reformation in, 57.
- James I., accession, 363, Hampton Court conference, 364 sq., characteristics, 365, 366, absolutist tendencies, 374, 387, Authorized Version, 376 sq., Episcopacy in Scotland, 379 sq., answer to Laud, 381, relations to Abbot, 383, 386, friendly to Calvinists, 384, "Book of Sports," 337, 402, Synod of Dort, 387, 388, zeal for Calvinism abates, 388, relations to Laud, 388, 389, death and influence, 390.
- Jansenists, adherence to Augustine, 343.
- Jerome, influence of Wyclif, 42.
- Jesuits, Pelagianism of, 343.
- Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, 276, 284, on vestments, 279, 280, on scarcity of clergy, 281, importance of work, 282 sq., sermons at Paul's Cross, 284, 285, "Apology," 285, 286, remains in church, 315, acquaintance with Hooker, 350, line of argument, 356, ceremonies, 359.
- Joan of Kent, 143, 144.
- John, Bishop, Parker's consecration, 267.
- John, Cardinal of Crema, 18.
- John, King, relations to Rome, 25 sq., Magna Charta, 27, pays feudatory tribute to Innocent, 38.
- John of Gaunt, relations to Wyclif, 37, 39, 40.
- John, Roman abbot and precursor, 6.
- John VI., relations to Wilfrid, 8.
- Julius II., on Alexander VI., 51, dispensation for marriage of Henry and Catharine, 71.
- Justification by Faith, Ten Articles, 104, Bishop's book on, 106, 288.
- Juxon, Archbishop of Canterbury, 442.
- Keble, on Hooker, 352, 353, 355, 357.
- Kidderminster, Richard, upholds Benefit of clergy, 66.
- Kilwardy, Robert de, appointed to Canterbury, 30.
- King, Bishop of London, divorce of Countess of Essex, 386, "King's Book," 119.
- Kitchin, Bishop, 262, Parker's consecration, 267.
- Knewstubb, at Hampton Court Conference, 364.
- Knox, John, relations to English reformers, 239.
- Kyme, Anne, 118.
- Lamb, consecrated to Brechin, 380.
- Lambert, Zwinglian views, 108.
- Lambeth Articles, 343 sq., 367, 398.
- Lanfranc, 12, on Transubstantiation, 43.
- Langden, Abbot of, 93.
- Langland, author of "Piers Ploughman's Creed," 45.
- Langton, Stephen, 19, see of Canterbury, 25, excommunicated, 27.
- Laski, John, 160, hard fate of his congregation, 192.
- Lasko, John A. See Laski.
- Latimer, Hugh, suspect, 80, preaches reform, 102, 157, dissents from Six Articles, 109, 110, on abuses of Reformation, 189, committed, 192, eucharistic discussions at Oxford, 200-202, trial postponed, 213, 215, trial, 218 sq., burned, 220 sq., characteristics, 222, 223.
- Laud, William, Scotch conform-

- ity, 381, relations to James, 388, 389, 395, recommends Montagu to appeal to king, 390, influence over Charles, 391 sq., coronation, 392, life sketched, 392 sq., principles, 393 sq., relations to Williams, 395, 405, 415, defends Montagu, 396, Erastianism, 397, Bishop of London, 398, loss of Buckingham, 398, civil and political work, 398 sq., archbishop, 400, relations to Hyde, 400, 401, refuses cardinal's hat, 402, "Book of Sports," 402, position of altar, 402 sq., ritual controversy, 405, 406, on wafers, 406, Transubstantiation, 406, work in Ireland and Scotland, 406 sq., Scotch Prayer-Book, 406 sq., action of Convocation, 411, 412, warned by Sanderson, 412, attacked by mob, 412, attack of Dering, 415, charged with high treason, 416, in Tower, 416, consistency, 418, fright at king's concessions, 421, persecuted and insulted, 430, 431, trial, 431 sq., defence, 431, 432, convicted, 432, beheaded, 433, summing up, 433.
- Lawrence, Archbishop, on Cranmer and Calvin, 294.
- Lay baptism, 287, 366.
- Lechler, on Wyclif, 37.
- Lee, visitor of monks, 91, Six Articles, 109.
- Legget, Bartholomew, 385, 386.
- Leicester, Earl of, ritual position, 310, influence on Elizabeth, 319, plot against Whitgift, 331.
- Leighton, visitor of monks, 91.
- Lent, observance of, under Edward VI., 140.
- Leo X., 51.
- Leo XIII., on Anglican orders, 274 sq.
- Linacre, 58.
- Lingard, on Six Articles, 110, on Henry VIII. and Catharine Parr, 118, on relations between Paul IV. and Elizabeth, 250, on Parker's consecration, 270, 271, 272, on excommunication of Elizabeth, 346, 347.
- Litany, English versions of, 119, 136, 165, 166.
- Lollards, 44 sq., oppose pilgrimages, 53. See Wyclif.
- London, visitor of monks, 91, 96.
- London, Synod of (1552), 177.
- Long Parliament. See Parliament.
- Longer and Shorter Catechisms, 424.
- Louis VII., sides against Becket, 23.
- Luther and Lutherans, 54, 59, theses and letters, 67, 68, reply to Henry, 69, influence of doctrine, 302, disciple of Augustine, 343.
- Machyn, diary, 270.
- Magna Charta, 22, 27.
- Marprelate controversy, 336 sq.
- Marriage of clergy. See Celibacy.
- Marriage Service. See Prayer-Book.
- Martin V. complains of anti-papal statutes, 47, character, 50.
- Martin, royal commissioner, 216, 217.
- Martyr, Peter, 142, 143, 156, second Prayer-Book, 159, 160, roughly handled, 189, allowed to depart, 192, letter from Sampson, 280, body of wife maltreated, 240, 241, letter to, concerning Parker's consecration, 270, 271.
- Mary, Queen, 72, declared illegitimate, 102, protests against changes, 126, relation to Ref-

- ormation, 181, 182, 186 sq., 198, accession, 185 sq., prohibits religious discussion, 188 sq., hatred of Cranmer, 191, 229, crowned, 193, first Parliament, 193, divorce of Henry and Catharine quashed, 194, treatment of Elizabeth, 194, ecclesiastical changes, 195, 196, spares Cranmer, 196, 197, negotiations with pope, 197, proposed marriage with Philip, 197 sq., distasteful to people, 199, second Parliament, 199, marriage, 202, new epoch in English Church, 203 sq., third Parliament, 204, 205, reconciliation of England with Rome, 204, 205, persecutions, 206 sq., 212 sq., 241, effects, 209, 215 sq., 244 sq., number burned, 213, petition to, in behalf of Cranmer and others, 213, 214; answer, 214, property restored to Church, 224, Cranmer's degradation, 225 sq., reasons for zeal, 232, death of Cranmer, 234 sq., defence of Pole, 242, 243, personal failings, 243 sq., death, 244, virtues, 245, relations to Elizabeth, 245, 247.
- Mary, sister of Henry VIII., 182.
- Mary, Queen of Scots, 204, 340.
- Mason, publisher of "Lambeth Record," 270.
- Mass. See Communion, Holy; Real Presence, Transubstantiation.
- Master, parish priest of "Nun of Kent," 83, 84.
- Matilda, 19.
- Matthew Paris, on papal provisions, 29.
- Matthew's Bible, 106, 283.
- May, Bishop, first Prayer-Book, 133.
- May, Dr., first Prayer-Book, 133.
- "Mayflower," 327.
- Mayne, Cuthbert, death, 347.
- Medici, Giovanni de, 50.
- Mendicant Orders. See Regular Clergy, Wyclif, and under individual titles.
- Mennonites, 298.
- Merrick, consecrated Bishop of Bangor by Parker, 276.
- Millenarians, condemned in Articles, 297.
- Milton, against Episcopacy, 417, on state of things after expulsion of bishops, 426, on Presbyterians, 442.
- Mirandola, Pico della, 57.
- Monasteries, suppression of, 90 sq.
- Monk, General, 438, 439.
- Montagu, Richard, 390, 396, 398.
- Montfort, Simon de, debt of English to, 27.
- More, Thomas, 58, 79, 80, on "Nun of Kent," 83, refuses oath to succession of children of Anne Boleyn, 84, animosity of king, 84, 85, execution, 85.
- Morgan, Judge, 199.
- Mortmain, Statute of, 31, suspended, 206.
- Morton, Bishop of Durham, Nag's Head fable, 269, on Long Parliament commission, 417, in custody, 420.
- Mountague, Chief Justice, 183.
- Mountain, Bishop, licenses Sibthorp's sermon, 397, removed to York, 398.
- Nag's Head fable, 268, 269.
- Neal, on Hampton Court Conference, 367, on James, 389, on Root and Branch bill, 423.
- Neale, chaplain to Bonner, probable author of Nag's Head fable, 268.
- "Necessary Erudition of Any Christian Man," 119.
- Nicholas V., 50.
- Nicholas, Henry, 329.

- Neile, Bishop of Winchester, 397.
- New Testament. See Bible.
- Nicholson, Zwinglian views, 108.
- Nidd River, council on (706), 8.
- Noailles. See De Noailles.
- Non-Conformity. See Dissenters.
- Non-juring bishops, 277, 278.
- Norfolk, Duke of, sent against Pilgrimage of Grace, 95, hatred of Cromwell, 111, relations to Cranmer, 115, arrest, 115, relations to Brown, 325.
- Norman conquest, effect of, on Church, 12 sq.
- Northampton, Council of, 23.
- Northumberland, Duke of, 146, recommends Hooper for see of Gloucester, 156, power, 182, Lady Jane Grey, 183, fall and death, 185, 186.
- Norwich, Bishop of, imprisons Brown, 326.
- Nottingham, Earl of, Parker's consecration, 270.
- Nowell, Dean, 286, 290, 291.
- Nun of Kent, 83, 84.
- Offa, of Mercia, 8.
- Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, 251, 262.
- Oldcastle, Sir John, 46.
- Orange, Prince of, 384.
- Orders. See Parker, Matthew.
- Ordinal, first, 148 sq., second, 151, 176, of Elizabeth, 260, of Exeter, 275.
- Original sin, 297, 298.
- Ornaments Rubric, 137, 147, 148, 258, 455, 456.
- Oswi, decides Easter controversy, 4.
- Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, 365, 369, Authorized Version, 377.
- Owen, John, intercession for Peacock, 438.
- Oxford, University of, relations to Wyclif, 41, 42, 44, Lutheran doctrines in, 68, Cardinal College, 69, on divorce of Henry and Catharine, 76, on royal supremacy, 82, eucharistic discussions at, 201, 202, burning of bishops at, 215 sq., visitation under Pole, 240, High Church stronghold, 310, surrenders to Parliament, 433.
- Papacy, Pope, rejection of supremacy, 2, appeals to, in early English Church, 7, reasons for supremacy, 9-11, Archbishop of Canterbury, papal legate, 19, 25, Constitutions of Clarendon, 22, 23, murder of Becket, 24, case of Langton, 25 sq., Magna Charta, 27, subsidies, 28, papal provisions, 28, 29, 33, 34, Statute of Mortmain, 31, "clericis laicos," 32, Statute of Carlisle, 32, Statute of Provisors, 33, 34 sq., Statute of Præmunire, 34, 47, Wyclif, 36 sq., 41, 45, "Good Parliament," 39, papal schism, 42, fifteenth century, 49 sq., English movement against at first political and social, 67, divorce of Henry and Catharine, 71 sq., 76, 78, policy of Cromwell, 81, Ten Articles, 103 sq., irregular Convocation of York, 105, Six Articles, 108 sq., 113, 127, Cranmer attacked, 113 sq., reasons for rejecting supremacy, 152, Eleven Articles, 301. See Clement VII., Gregory XI., Pius II., Pius IV., Pius V., Martin V., Paschal II., Urban V., Paul II., Paul III., Paul IV., Sixtus IV., William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry I., Stephen, Edward I., Edward II., Edward III., Edward VI., Henry VIII., Mary, Elizabeth, Cranmer, Parker, Royal Supremacy.

- "Paraphrase" of Erasmus, 126.
 Pardons, 298.
 Paris, Matthew, on papal provisions, 29.
 Paris, University of, on divorce of Henry and Catharine, 76.
 Parker, Matthew, Prayer-Book revision, 252, 257, consecration, 265 sq., characteristics, 265, 266, objections to validity, 268 sq., consecrates other bishops, 276, 284, difficulties of position, 277 sq., 280 sq., reply to Heath, 278, firmness on Catholic character of Church of England, 282, 299, against Pius IV., 279, 346, Nowell's Catechism, 290, 291, revision of Articles, 301 sq., on ritual irregularities, 306, on Advertisements, 308, death, 317, rebukes Elizabeth, 317.
 Parker, Mrs. Matthew, 281, 282.
 Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, 315, ordered to repress "Prophesyings," 320, 321.
 Parliament, "Good," 39, Long, 413, 414 sq., dissolves, 439, Short, 410, 411, Rump, 433, 437, 438, 439, convention, 441 sq., 444 sq., 448, second of Charles II., 447 sq. For others, see England, Church of.
 Parr, Catharine, 114, accusation, 116, defence, 117, 118, marries Seymour, 145.
 Parsons, Jesuit missionary, 347, 348.
 Paschal II., complains of want of respect of English Church, 16.
 Paschasius Radbertus, on Transubstantiation, 43, 143.
 Paul II., character, 50.
 Paul III., confers hat on Fisher, 85.
 Paul IV., relations to Pole, 242, 243, to Elizabeth, 250.
 Peacock, charges against, 438.
 Peccham, Archbishop, controversy with Edward I., 31.
 Pecoock, on Pilgrimages, 54.
 Peito, made legate, 243.
 Pelagius, Pelagianism, 293, 343.
 Penance, defined in Ten Articles, 103, Cranmer's views, 132.
 Penry, Marprelate controversy, 338.
 "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church," 341.
 Peter's Pence, 8, 13.
 Petrarch, 56.
 Philibert, suitor to Elizabeth, 246.
 Philip II., 197 sq., lands in England, 346, 347, Spanish wealth brought into England, 203, intercedes for Elizabeth and Courtenay, 203, 204, connection with persecutions, 212, on Continent at time of Cranmer's degradation, 229, desertion of Mary, 244, urges Philibert on Elizabeth, 246, relations to Elizabeth, 250, St. Bartholomew, 314.
 Philpot, Archdeacon of Winchester, defends Catharine, 196.
 Pico della Mirandola, 57.
 "Piers Ploughman's Creed," 45.
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 95, 101.
 Pilgrimages, 53, 54, 107.
 Pilgrim Fathers, 327.
 Pius II., 50.
 Pius IV., 279, 346.
 Pius V., excommunication of Elizabeth, 346, 347.
 Pole, Cardinal, on Royal Supremacy, 86, 87, proposed legateship opposed by Gardiner, 197, legate, 204, 205, characteristics, 207, 208, 244, policy concerning burnings, 213, attempts at reform, 224, 225, relations to Cranmer, 225, consecration, 240, papal charges against, 242, 243, death, 244.

- Politian, 57.
 Poole, Bishop, 262, Parker's consecration, 267.
 "Poor Priests," 42.
 Peynet, Bishop of Winchester, succeeds Gardiner, 155, 290.
 Præmunire, Statute of, 34, 47, 81, 207, 243, 252, 255.
 Prayer-Book, first, 122, 133 sq., 147 sq., 177, 178, points of difference from one now in use, 136, 137, ritual directions, 137, 138, Act of Uniformity, 138 sq., opposed, 141, second Book, 158 sq., 163 sq., 177, 178, Elizabethan, 252, 257, 286, changes under James, 369, 449, Scotch, 406 sq., American, 408, use abolished, 426, 427, under Presbyterians, 442 sq., Savoy Conference, 444 sq., changes under Charles I., 449 sq.
 Prayers for the dead, Cranmer subscribes to doctrine, 233, under Elizabeth, 257.
 Predestination, 343 sq., 400. See Presbyterians.
 Presbyterians, 309, 316, first Presbytery in England, 317, 325, offspring of English Puritanism, 327, Bancroft against, 340, in Scotland, 380, Root and Branch bill, 417, 418, Westminster Assembly, 424 sq., divisions, 428 sq., after death of Charles I., 435 sq., "Engagement," 435, 436, hopes on Charles II.'s accession, 441, despotism, 441, conference at Worcester House, 443, Savoy Conference, 444 sq., second Parliament of Charles II., 447 sq.
 Pride's Purge, 439.
 Processions, 257.
 Proctor, "History of the Book of Common Prayer," 451.
 Propheysings, 320, 321.
 Provisors, Statute of, 33, 34, 39.
 Prynne, in pillory, 415, treatment of Laud, 431, on Laud's defence, 432.
 Purgatory, 79, defined in Ten Articles, 103, Bishop's book on, 106, Cranmer subscribes to, 233, Article on, 298.
 Puritans, 277, 281, 287, 311 sq., 314 sq., 318, 319, 346 sq., Separatists and Brownists, 325 sq., in Church, 328 sq., 333 sq., 339 sq., Marprelate controversy, 336 sq., Sabbatarianism, 341, 342, low ebb at death of Elizabeth, 349, under James, 363 sq., 367 sq., 387 sq., under Bancroft, 373, under Abbot, 384 sq., under Charles I., 391 sq., 410 sq., position of altar, 402 sq., Long Parliament, 414 sq., Root and Branch bill, 417, 418, Grand Remonstrance, 419, tyranny, 426 sq., divisions, 428, 429, after death of Charles I., 435 sq., "Engagement," 435, 436, conference at Worcester House, 443, Savoy Conference, 443 sq., second Parliament of Charles II., 447 sq.
 Purge, Pride's, 439.
 Pym, attacks Arminians, 398, grievances, 410, charged with treason, 421.
 Quartodecimans, British Church not on side of, 4.
 Radbertus, on Eucharist, 43, 143.
 Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, 16, 17.
 Ratramus, on Eucharist, 43, 143.
 Real Presence, defined in Ten Articles, 103, in Six Articles, 109, controversy, 141 sq., second Prayer-Book, 173, 174, 175, Black Rubric, 456 sq. See Communion, Holy; Transubstantiation, Jewel.

- Recusancy Laws, 347 sq., 389.
 Reformatio legum ecclesiasticorum, 314.
 Reformation, Anglican. See Anglican Reformation.
 Reformation, continental. See Germany, Swiss Reformation.
 "Reformation Settlement," 122.
 Reginald, sub-prior of Canterbury, 25.
 Regular clergy, 10, 30, 51 sq., opposition of Wyclif, 37, 52, suppression of houses, 90 sq.
 Religious houses. See Regular Clergy.
 Remonstrance, Grand, 419.
 Renaissance, 56 sq.
 Restoration, 440, 441 sq.
 Reynolds, Dr., Hampton Court Conference, 364, 367, conforms, 368, Authorized Version, 377.
 Rheims New Testament, 376.
 Rich, Lady, 393.
 Richard le Grand, 28.
 Richardson, Chief Justice, 402.
 Ridley, recommends destruction of images, 125, 157, first Prayer-Book, 133, views on Eucharist, 143, Joan of Kent, 144, succeeds Bonner, 155, relations to Hooper, 156, communion tables, 158, influences Cranmer, 161, 222, Articles, 177, Eucharistic discussion at Oxford, 200-203, reconciled with Hooper, 210, 211, trial postponed, 213, 215, trial, 218 sq., burned, 220 sq., characteristics, 222, influence on Edward, 222.
 Ritual, 141, 263, 305 sq., 367, 455 sq. See Laud, Vestments, Ornaments Rubric.
 Robert de Kilwardy, appointed to Canterbury, 30.
 Robert of Normandy, 19.
 Rogers, John, Matthew's Bible, 106, refuses to take part in Eucharistic controversy, 202, tried, 208, burned, 209, 289.
 Roman Catholics in England in Elizabeth's reign, 346 sq., Gunpowder Plot, 375, under James, 388 sq.
 Rome, Church of. See Papacy, Pope.
 Root and Branch bill, 417, 418, 423.
 Rouse, Francis, 398.
 Royal Supremacy, 66, 67, 82, 86, 87, 124, 216, 217, 254, 263. See under individual monarchs.
 Runnymede, 27.
 Sabbatarianism, 341, 342, Hooker in opposition, 360, "Book of Sports," 387, 402.
 Sacraments, 298, Hooker's view, 358. See under individual titles.
 St. Bartholomew massacre, 314.
 St. Maur, Benedictines of, 52.
 St. Quentin, 242.
 Saints, position of Ten Articles toward, 104, of first Prayer-Book, 137, reason for rejecting invocation, 152, Cranmer subscribes to doctrine, 233, condemned in Articles, 298.
 Salisbury, Countess of, beheaded, 112.
 Sampson, Dr., defence of Royal Supremacy, 87, to Peter Martyr on Parker's consecration, 271, on ritual, 280.
 Sancroft, Prayer-Book revision, 457.
 Sanders, burned, 209, 210.
 Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln, warns Laud, 413, Restoration bishop, 443, Prayer-Book revision, 452.
 Sandys, consecrated by Parker, 276, at convocation of 1563, 287, work on Bible, 290, remains in Church, 315, Bishop's Bible, 376.

- Sarum Missal, 128, 136, pontifical, 149.
 Savile, Authorized Version Bible, 377.
 Savonarola, monastic reforms, 52.
 Savoy Conference, 444 sq.
 Sawtre, William, 46.
 Saxon invasion, 3.
 Scory, Bishop of Chichester, 183, Parker's consecration, 267, 268, 269.
 Scotch Prayer-Book. See Prayer-Book.
 Scotland, attempted papal suzerainty over, 32, reintroduction of Episcopacy into, 379 sq., "The Tables," 409, Solemn League and Covenant, 409, General Assembly, 410, Charles yields, 418. See England, Church of; Laud.
 Scott, Walter, picture of James I., 365.
 Secular clergy, 10, in fifteenth century, 51.
 Selborne, Lord, on Advertisements, 309.
 Separatists, 325 sq.
 Seymour, Earl of Hertfort. See Somerset.
 Seymour, Jane, 102.
 Seymour, Thomas, 145.
 Shakespeare, picture of Cranmer, 113.
 Shaxton, dissents from Six Articles, 109, 110, preaches at execution of Anne Askew, 118.
 Sheldon, Bishop of London, 443, 445.
 Shirley, Professor, on Lollards, 44.
 Short Parliament. See Parliament.
 Shrewsbury, Earl of, 183.
 Sibthorp, sermon on divine right of kings, 397.
 Six Articles, Statute of, 108 sq., modified, 113, repealed, 127.
 Sixtus IV., 50.
 Skip, Bishop, first Prayer-Book, 133.
 "Smectymnus," 417.
 Smith, Dr. Miles, on Authorized Version, 377.
 Smith, Dr., preacher at execution of Latimer and Ridley, 221.
 Solemn League and Covenant, 409, 412, 424, 425, 435.
 Somerset, Duke of, 120, 123, Protector, 124, changes, 124, royal visitation, 125, 126, fall, 145, 146, 178, House, 179.
 Somerset House, 179.
 Spain, war with France, 242. See Philip II.
 Sparkes, Hampton Court Conference, 364.
 "Sports, Book of," 387, 402, 410.
 Spotswood, consecrated to Glasgow, 380.
 Standish, Henry, defends Act on Benefit of Clergy, 66.
 Stapleton, on Parker, 268.
 Star Chamber abolished, 419.
 Stephen, King, policy toward Rome, 20.
 Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, 11.
 Story, royal commissioner, 216.
 Strafford, bill against, 416, death, 418.
 Succession Act, 84, 183.
 Sudely, Lord, 145.
 Suffolk, Duke of, 182, rebellion, 199, death, 199.
 Supererogation, works of, 298.
 Supremacy, Act of, 262, 291.
 "Supreme Governor," 255.
 "Supreme Head of the Church," 255.
 Surry, Earl of, execution, 120.
 Sutton, Thomas, 386.
 Sweden, King of, proposes marriage to Elizabeth, 246.
 Swiss Reformation and influence

- on England, 176, 239, 290, 295, 298, 309, 316, 329.
- Tables, The, 409.
- Tailour dissents from Six Articles, 109.
- Taylor, Bishop of Lincoln, first Prayer-Book, 133, at Mary's first Parliament, 193.
- Taylor, incumbent of Hadley, burned, 210, 212.
- Ten Articles, 103 sq.
- Testa, William de, 32.
- Theobald, inhibited by Stephen, 20.
- Theodore of Tarsus, 5 sq.
- Thirlby, Bishop, first Prayer-Book, 133, relations to Cranmer, 225 sq., treatment under Elizabeth, 262.
- Thirty nine Articles. See Articles.
- Thomas, St. See Becket.
- Thornton, Bishop of Dover, 91, 190.
- Thurston, consecrated to York by Calixtus II., 17, 18.
- Transubstantiation, attacked by Wyclif, 38, 43, 41, 109, in King's Book, 119, controversies, 142, reasons for rejecting, 152, Cranmer's views, 161, 162, convocation under Mary on, 196, reformers burned for denying, 209 sq., 219, 220, Cranmer's submission, 233, Jewel's challenge, 285, adoration condemned in Articles, 298, Laud charged with views on, 403, Black Rubric, 456 sq.
- Trask, reply to "Book of Sports," 387.
- Travers, "Book of Discipline," 329, candidate for mastership of Temple, 332, reader at Temple, 351, 352, controversy with Hooker, 352, 354.
- Treason Act, 84.
- Trent, Council of, 155.
- "Triers," 436, 437.
- Tulchan bishops, 380.
- Tunstall, Bishop of London, tries Bilney and Arthur, 70, guidance of Edward, 120, imprisoned, 158, no burnings under, 213, treatment under Elizabeth, 262, Parker's consecration, 267.
- Turberville, Bishop, 262.
- Tyndale, translation of New Testament, 69, 70, 106, 288.
- Udal, Marprelate controversy, 338.
- Ultramontanes, 355.
- Uniformity, Act of. See Act of Uniformity.
- Universities, support convocation under Elizabeth, 255. See Cambridge, Oxford.
- Usher, Bishop, on Long Parliament commission, 417, defence of Episcopacy, 417.
- Vane, Sir Harry, 425, an Independent, 428.
- Verbal Treason Act, 84.
- Vesey, Dr., on rights of crown, 66.
- Vestments, 170, 173, 257, 258, 261, 279, 280, 305 sq., 370.
- Via Media, 104, 282.
- Vitalian, Pope, sends Theodore to England, 5.
- Von Hutten, 59.
- Wafers, 406.
- Walker, "Sufferings of the Clergy," 430.
- Walton, on Hooker, 352, 353, 354, bishop, 443.
- Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, 64, on spread of heresies, 68, relations to divorce of Henry and Catharine, 73.
- Warwick. See Northumberland.
- Wentworth, Protestant position, 313.

- Westcott, on English Bible, 379.
 Westminster Abbey, rebuilt by Edward the Confessor, 11.
 Westminster Assembly, 424 sq.
 Westminster, Synod at (1125), 18.
 Weston prolocutor at Oxford disputations, 201.
 "Whip with Six Strings," 110.
 Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, 343, 344.
 Whitby, conference at (664 A.D.), 4.
 White, Bishop of Lincoln, trial of Ridley and Latimer, 218 sq.
 Whitgift, Archbishop on Advertisements, 308, against Cartwright, 316, 317, sketch of life, 325, made archbishop, 325, strong position against Puritans, 329 sq., Twenty-four Articles, 331, dispute concerning mastership of Temple, 352, effect of policy on Church, 333 sq., canon on discipline, 334, intercedes for Udal and Cartwright, 338, against Sabbatarianism, 342, Calvinistic tendency, 343, 345, line of argument, 356, at Hampton Court Conference, 364, death and character, 369, debt to, 370, sermons, 370.
 Whyting, Robert, judicial murder, 98, 99.
 Wightman, Edward, 386.
 Wilcox, admonition to Parliament, 316.
 Wilfrid, Bishop of York, on Easter, 4, collision with Theodore, 5, appeal to Rome, 6, imprisoned, 6, interest of case, 7, missionary work, 7, further controversy, 8, death, 8.
 William of Corbeil, 18.
 William Rufus, 14.
 William the Conqueror, relations to Rome, 12 sq.
 William the Silent, 348.
 Williams, John, Dean of Westminster, 388, 392, relations to Laud, 395, 396, 405, 415, on Long Parliament commission, 417, protest of expelled bishops, 420, accused of treason, 420.
 Winchelsea, Archbishop, controversy with Edward, 32.
 Wolsey, Thomas, power, 64, condemns Lutheran doctrines, 68, virtues, 69, legate, 69, cardinal's college, 69, relations to divorce of Henry and Catharine, 72 sq., fall, 75.
 Worms, Concordat of, Investiture and Homage settlement, 16.
 Wren, Prayer-Book revision, 450.
 Wriothesley, Chancellor, 120, 123.
 Würtemberg, Conference of, 302.
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, rebellion, 199, recantation, 203.
 Wyclif, John, 36 sq., 38-41, commissioner at Bruges, 39, "Good Parliament," 39, summoned for heresies, 40, bulls of Gregory XI., 41, against papal tributes, 41, reply to bulls, 42, to bishops, 42, translation of Bible, 42, attacks Transubstantiation, 43, theses condemned at Blackfriars, 44, close of life and influence, 44, 45, on state of clergy, 51.
 York, relations to Canterbury, 17, 19, irregular convocation of, 105, convocation of 1604, 371.
 Young, Bishop of St. David's, 276.
 Zwingli, view of Eucharist, 142. See Swiss Reformation.

